

U. 8

EL
E

RY
SCAN
NOY,
ELY

THE AMERICAN CHURCH MONTHLY

Selden Peabody Delany, D.D., Editor

September, 1920

Vol. 8 No. 1

Editorial Comment	- - - -	3
Male Births After War.—The Desire to be Comfortable.—Shall We Expurgate the New Testament?—The Anglo-Catholic Congress.—The Bracing Criticism of Dean Inge.		
Psychoanalysis and Divine Grace	- -	12
<i>Jared S. Moore.</i>		
Why the Church Attracts Denominationalists	-	24
<i>Arthur G. Roberts.</i>		
The Perennial Heresy of Opportunism	- -	35
<i>Marlinspike.</i>		
Some Reflections on a Pamphlet	- -	43
<i>John Cole McKim.</i>		
The Nicene Creed ; an Impassable Barrier	-	55
<i>Ernest Pugh.</i>		
Theory and Practice in Religious Education	-	62
<i>Mildred Merrill.</i>		
Book Reviews	- - - -	74

Entered as second-class matter at the Post Office, New Brunswick, N. J., under Act of March 3, 1879

Issued by the TEMPLE PUBLISHING CO., 42 Albany Street
New Brunswick, New Jersey

EDWIN S. GORHAM, Business Manager
OFFICES: 42 ALBANY STREET, NEW BRUNSWICK, N. J.
11 West 45th Street, New York, N. Y.

"I very cheerfully enclose \$2.00 for the renewal of my subscription. I was one of the first subscribers and I have enjoyed the AMERICAN CHURCH MONTHLY every month since."
(Signed) CAPTAIN D. R. FAY, Dallas, Texas.

The American Church Monthly

Fourth Year

A magazine of comment, criticism and review dealing with questions confronting the Anglican Communion and more especially the Church in the United States. Subscription, \$2.00 a year. 25c a copy.

SELDEN PEABODY DELANY, D.D., Editor.

From the Bishop of Pennsylvania: "I am very glad to express my approval of the American Church Monthly and my conviction that it will occupy an important place in our church life."

The American Church Monthly is reaching a large and growing audience of readers, worthy of the traditions of our Communion, and drawing to its staff of contributors a continuous exhibit of latent scholarship which has long waited an outlet for its encouragement.

FOR RENEWALS DUE.

The circulation of the "American Church Monthly" has been maintained and somewhat increased from the time of its first publication. We believe that, as a magazine, it has been constantly improving and fills a distinct position in the literature of the Church, which was needed, and that it is worthy of a much wider circulation. Although the cost of publication has been increased, and we have no desire of increasing it because we desire its wide circulation among the Clergy and thoughtful laymen. The circulation ought to be trebled, and if this could be done, it would put the magazine beyond any thought of ever increasing the price.

We are asking our friends to procure additional subscriptions. If you appreciate the magazine, as we think you do, you will be glad to make the effort. In addition to this, the publisher would be very glad to receive a list of names from you which might be canvassed.

EDWIN S. GORHAM, Manager

11 WEST 45th STREET . . . NEW YORK

ADD THE

Handbooks of Catholic Faith and Practice

TO YOUR LIBRARY

The following list shows how varied is the ground
covered by them:

SECOND SERIES

The Eucharistic Sacrifice, By Rev. Darwell Stone, D.D. (Ready in August). 1.80.

Broad Church Theology: Its Limitations and Defects. By Rev. W. J. Sparrow Simpson, D.D. 1.35.

FIRST SERIES

Each volume 1.15.

Reunion. By Rev. S. L. Ollard.

The Missionary Question. A general Survey. By the Rev. M. R. Newbolt.

The Virgin Birth of Our Lord. By the Rev. Leonard Prestige.

The Episcopate and the Reformation. By the Rev. Professor J. P. Whitney, B.D.

The Place of the Laity in the Church. By W. J. Sparrow Simpson, G. Bayfield Roberts, Gordon Crosse, N. P. Williams.

The Place of Women in the Church. A series of papers as follows: The Teaching of St. Paul as to the Position of Women, Rev. Canon Goudge;

Ministrations of Women in Church, Rev. Dr. Darwell Stone; The Ministry of Women and the Tradition of the Church, Rev. Dr. W. J. Sparrow Simpson; The Claim of the Priesthood for Women, Lady Henry Somerset; The Ordination of Women, Geraldine E. Hodgson; The Medical Ministry of Women, Mary Scharlieb, M.D.; The Religious Life for Women, Mrs. Romanes; Younger Women and the Church, Miss E. K. Sanders.

Catholic or Roman Catholic. By the Rev. T. J. Hardy, M.A.

Conscience of Sin: Six Lenten Sermons. By the Rev. T. A. Lacey, M.A.

Defects in English Religion. By the Rev. J. N. Figgis, D.D.

Recent French Tendencies. By the Rev. G. C. Rawlinson, M.A.

The Prayer of Consecration. By the Rev. W. J. Sparrow Simpson, D.D.

The Reserved Sacrament. By the Rev. Darwell Stone, D.D.

The Sacrament of Penance. By the Rev. H. U. Whelpton, M.A.

Morehouse Publishing Co.

1801-1811 Fond du Lac Avenue
MILWAUKEE, WIS.

CONTRIBUTORS FOR SEPTEMBER

Jared S. Moore, Ph.D., is Professor of Philosophy in Western Reserve University in Cleveland, Ohio.

The Rev. Arthur G. Roberts is Rector of the Church in Corona, Long Island.

The Rev. John Cole McKim, M.A., is a Missionary Priest in Japan.

The Rev. Ernest Pugh is Rector of the Church in Plymouth, Mass.

Mildred Merrill is a Public School and Church School Teacher of New York.

The American Church Monthly

*A Magazine of comment, criticism and review dealing
with questions confronting the Anglican Communion
and more especially the Church in the United States*

TEMPLE PUBLISHING CORPORATION

42 Albany St., New Brunswick, N. J.

President: GEORGE A. ARMOUR, Princeton, N. J.

Vice-President: GUY VAN AMRINGE, 55 Liberty Street, New York

Secretary: THE REV. CHARLES C. EDMUNDS, D.D., 6 Chelsea Square, New York

Treasurer: HALEY FISKE, 1 Madison Avenue, New York

Two Dollars a Year

Twenty-five Cents a Copy

Canadian subscription, \$2.25 a Year

Foreign subscription, \$2.50 a Year

Volume VIII

SEPTEMBER, 1920

Number 1

Male Births After War

IN 1914, shortly after the outbreak of war, an agnostic woman of our acquaintance was grievously distressed at being told by some physician that in time of war more boy babies were born than girl babies. The cause of her distress was that this seemed to point to an intelligent force controlling the universe and therefore to prove indisputably the existence of God. That would necessitate the complete revision of her philosophy of life. We asked several physicians about the matter, and they assured us that it was as the woman had feared. An investigation of statistics made

at the time however led us to the conclusion that there was no noticeable increase in male births after periods of war.

Recently we were impressed by the fact that a large proportion of the infants presented for baptism since the war have been male infants. We should like to hear from other clergy on this point. We therefore consulted an expert statistician, Dr. Louis I. Dublin of the Metropolitan Life Insurance Company, and the following interesting facts we owe to his painstaking investigations.

There are no data available for the year 1919. The best data for 1918 showed that for the groups of States reporting births to the United States government, the sex ratio was 1058 male births per 1000 female births. The same ratio was shown for 1917. In 1916 the figure was 1057; and in 1915, 1055. In some states during 1918 the proportion of male births was greater, and in others, less than in 1917. Connecticut, Maine, Massachusetts, Minnesota, Vermont, Maryland, Indiana, Kentucky and Utah showed increases in the proportion of male to female births during 1918. There were significant decreases for Michigan, New Hampshire, Rhode Island, North Carolina, Virginia, Washington and Wisconsin. The figure was stationary during 1918 in New York, Pennsylvania and Ohio.

A series of sex ratios of births in New York City and Philadelphia is available from 1909 to 1918. The highest ratio in New York City, 1056, was shown in 1909 and the least in 1914. The next high point is shown for 1917, 1054. The 1918 ratio was one point lower than that of 1917. The Philadelphia series shows a maximum in 1913, 1081, and the minimum for 1910, 1040. From these quotations, it will be seen that an increase in the proportion of male births is not always recorded during and after war time.

These changes in the sex ratio of births occur because of shifting in the factors which influence the age at marriage, and the ages at which women have children. It has been shown from obstetrical statistics of many decades that the younger the mother, the higher the ratio of males in births to such mothers. Thus, from the registration statistics of 1918, the births to such mothers, 15 to 19 years of age, showed a sex ratio of 1065. Births to mothers, 35 to 39 years of age, registered a sex ratio of 1058. For more than 5,000 births to mothers, 45 to 49 years, the sex ratio was 1016. During war times, there are likely to be more marriages among young women than in ordinary times, when there are no such stimuli to marriage as recruiting, draft exemption, etc. The result is that an increased proportion of the births of the ensuing year will be to young mothers. It may be true, also, that the better economic conditions prevailing among wage-working civil populations in war-times are responsible for earlier marriages.

In order to illustrate the changes in the ages of mothers, we may quote from the available American birth statistics. Fifty-two per cent of the births of 1917 were to mothers between 20 and 39 years of age, whereas, 55 per cent of the births of 1918 occurred among mothers at this age period. There was also a significant increase in the percentage of births to mothers 15 to 19 years of age.

The data for England and Wales show slightly higher sex-ratios for the war years, 1914 to 1918. For the years 1911 to 1915 the ratio was 1038; during 1916, 1917 and 1918 the ratios were 1049, 1044 and 1048 respectively. Theoretically, the proportions of the two sexes should be approximately the same. But actually, the number of males exceeds the number of females at birth and this is explained by some students on the ground of ante-natal selection.

The Desire to Be Comfortable

THE predominating desire in many Christians is to be free from pain and discomfort. They think that one of the chief uses of religion is to make them comfortable. If they faithfully obey the precepts of the Church, they assume that they will in consequence be healthy, wealthy and wise, —beyond the average. There are many modern cults which set forth earthly rewards of health or prosperity as the leading inducement for prospective investors. It is to be feared however that this state of mind is not limited to the cults. It is to be found also in those Church people who suppose that so long as they practice their religion consistently, no physical harm can happen to them or to their property, and nothing can mar their happiness.

The trouble with such people is that they desire to follow Jesus, but without the cross, without thorns, without nails, without toil, and without suffering. They forget that only if we suffer with Him can we reign with Him, that without the cross there can be no crown. Not even the Blessed Virgin was permitted to look forward to a life of undisturbed peace and happiness. Simeon prophesied to her, "A sword shall pierce through thine own soul also." How much more then should we expect suffering, if we are faithful disciples of Jesus. "The disciple is not above his master." The world bring what it is, a life of faithful obedience to the will of God must encounter opposition, scorn, hatred, persecution. "All that will live godly in Christ Jesus shall suffer persecution."

There must be this element of bitterness in the life of every true Christian. We cannot remain in complete harmony with the careless, self-indulgent society of the unbelieving world. We must run counter to established preju-

dices. We must incur unpopularity with worldly-minded people in the Church. In fact the constant resistance to the temptation to be worldly-minded ourselves carries with it its own bitterness. The Bread of Life must always be slightly bitter in comparison with the ambrosial nectar of the world.

Shall We Expurgate the New Testament?

THE first volume of what promises to be an important work, "The Beginnings of Christianity," edited by F. J. Foakes-Jackson, D.D., and Kirsopp Lake, D.D., has just been published by Macmillan. This volume deals with the "Jewish, Gentile, and Christian Backgrounds." The editors, who are both priests in the English orders though at present professors at the Union Seminary and at Harvard respectively, think that the records of the life and teachings of Jesus are of a scant and scrappy character. The Gospel of S. Mark, they tell us, is not history in our sense of the term. The writer has sought mainly to edify his readers, not to tell the truth. He looked back on Jesus and His acts through a haze of faith. He has relied too much on the memory of eye-witnesses who have distorted the facts. The editors conclude that Jesus probably never spoke of Himself as the Son of Man, nor did He regard Himself as the Messiah. He was simply a prophet inspired by the Spirit of God. This general position may be inferred from these two sentences in the preface:—"It is becoming increasingly certain that Christianity in the first century achieved a synthesis between the Graeco-Oriental and the Jewish religion in the

Roman Empire. The preaching of repentance and of the Kingdom of God begun by Jesus passed into the sacramental cult of the Lord Jesus Christ."

It is a strange irony of fate that Protestantism should have begun with an appeal to the Bible, and the substitution of biblical authority for ecclesiastical authority; and that now it is Protestant scholars who are proving the Bible to be a tissue of myths and a distorted record of facts. It is Catholic scholars,—those who recognize the Church as the supreme authority in matters of faith—who are the chief defenders today of the trustworthiness of Scripture and its religious and spiritual value. We are not referring to the reconstruction of the traditional view of the Old Testament. That in the main is accepted by Catholic scholars. We are referring rather to those modern New Testament scholars,—such as Dr. Kirsopp Lake,—who would eliminate all miraculous elements from the Gospels, transform the incarnate Son of God into an inspired human teacher, and elevate S. Paul into the real founder of Catholic Christianity.

If the New Testament is so utterly unreliable as an historical document, if it gives a false impression of the teaching and deeds and person of Jesus, would it not be well to discontinue reading it in our churches? Or possibly the General Convention might be induced to appoint a commission, under the chairmanship of Dr. Kirsopp Lake, to edit an expurgated copy of the New Testament for the use of the faithful. This commission could delete all the exaggerated statements, all the miracles, and all the lies,—in short all that was seen through the haze of faith; and present us with the few bald facts that are visible to the penetrating gaze of modern liberalism.

The Anglo-Catholic Congress

ON the last two days in June and the first day in July an Anglo-Catholic Congress was held in London for the purpose of making clear to the world the position of Catholics in the Church of England. It appears to have been an overwhelming success, beyond the highest expectations of its promoters. 14,000 tickets were sold. 1,200 priests, vested uniformly in cassock, short surplice, and biretta, and 14 bishops in cope and mitre were in the street procession for the opening High Mass at S. Alban's Holborn. Many who witnessed the procession commented on the fine intellectuality and the impress of asceticism in the faces of these priests and bishops. 1500 masses were celebrated daily in London by the clergy attending the congress. Albert Hall was filled three times daily, and on the closing night was packed with more than 10,000 people. The favorite hymn, we are told by one who was present at all the sessions, was "We that hold the faith of Jesus," with the refrain "Hail Mary, full of grace." The Hail Mary was used with the Our Father at the opening devotions of each Albert Hall meeting. Women gave their beautiful jewels to help make up the £50,000 offering for missions. A correspondent writes, "Men and women knelt in the streets as the bishops passed along blessing the people. Men bared their heads as the procession of priests passed by. I never expected to see such sights." At any rate we may venture the assertion that if the Catholic Revival in the Anglican Communion is dead, it is still a somewhat lively corpse.

The Bracing Criticism of Dean Inge

IT is one of the most recurrent temptations of the orthodox to become narrow-minded; to feel that they are the people, and that wisdom shall die with them; to despise the work of scholars and to take refuge behind the bulwarks of the faith once revealed. We who are Catholics in the Anglican Church are continually in danger of yielding to this temptation. We like to read exclusively our own favorite Church paper, and books by writers of unquestioned loyalty to the Catholic faith, we even incline to associate only with people of our way of thinking; and we easily get into the way of looking down on all who think differently. Hence the attribute of spiritual pride which often makes Catholics so harsh and unlovable.

We know of no better cure for this state of mind than a liberal course of reading in the writings of Dr. William Ralph Inge, Dean of St. Paul's in London. Especially do we recommend his recent volume entitled "Outspoken Essays," published by Longmans. Though we may not always agree with him, we cannot fail to respect his fearlessness, his directness, his clear-headedness, and his reality. Here is a writer with no illusions as to present day civilization, who states his criticisms, often tinged with satire, in masterly English. These essays deal not only with religious questions, but with social and economic subjects, such as our present discontents, patriotism, the birth-rate, and the future of the English race. Of the religious essays, the best are those on "Bishop Gore and the Church of England," "Roman Catholic Modernism," "Cardinal Newman," "St. Paul," and "Institutionalism and Mysticism." His criticism of Bishop Gore is scrupulously fair for one who holds

the premises of Dean Inge; it seems to us a model of what religious controversy ought to be.

It is well that we should wake up to the fact that the attack on the Anglo-Catholic position has shifted its ground entirely. It is no longer animated by the old prejudices of evangelical Protestantism. Such men as Dean Inge, Dr. Headlam, and Canon Streeter, who are now our keenest critics, take their stand on principles far removed from those of the Reformation era. It behooves us to read these men, not only to know what those principles are, but to learn what are the vulnerable points in our own bulwarks.

Psychoanalysis and Divine Grace

JARED S. MOORE, Ph.D.

THE first reaction likely to be aroused in the minds of many who find this title on the cover of *THE AMERICAN CHURCH MONTHLY* will be one of repulsion at the thought of linking together two such apparently contradictory terms as appear therein. "What communion hath light with darkness?" one may ask, "and what concord hath Christ with Belial?" Can any good thing come out of psychoanalysis? Can the action of divine grace in that field have any other purpose than the utter casting out of the psychoanalyst and all his works?

There are two obstacles against a sane and healthy consideration of this topic—first, the ignorance and misconceptions concerning psychoanalysis which prejudice the mind of the average Christian believer, and, secondly, the indifference concerning religion or positive contempt for Christianity which so commonly characterizes the protagonists of psychoanalysis. The present writer, however, happens to be both tremendously interested in psychoanalysis and a fervent believer in the Christian religion, and to him there is no such antagonism between the speculations of modern psychology and the truths of the Christian religion as is often supposed. "Thanking in advance," then, any who may be willing to delve into these matters, for their patience and interest, he will make the plunge.

THE PSYCHOANALYTIC THEORY

First, as to the fundamental teachings of psychoanalysis. The term stands for three things—(1) a theory concerning the underlying motives of conduct, (2) a method for disclos-

ing these motives when they are as is so often the case hidden from view, and (3) a method for eradicating harmful or evil motives and substituting helpful and valuable ones for them. Our thoughts will be directed principally to the first of these usages. We must also at the outset acknowledge the profound indebtedness of all psychoanalysts to the pioneer work of Dr. Sigmund Freud, the founder of their doctrine, though in many by no means unimportant details we are obliged to dissent from his distinctive teachings. Freud's most characteristic work has been in the study of dreams and of mental diseases, but his principles have as valuable a significance for the waking life of the normal mind as they do for an understanding of sleep and the mind diseased.

The psychoanalytic conception of the mind is a development first of all of the view associated so decidedly with the psychology of the later nineteenth and opening twentieth centuries that by "mind" we mean far more than "personal consciousness"—that there are now and always "within my mind" a vast number of ideas, feelings, and desires of which "I" am not at the time "aware." For this vast hidden region of mental life—not by any means, as is so often erroneously taught by non-psychologists, a separate mind or a separate compartment of the mind—the term "*subconscious*" is commonly used. The doctrine merely means that just as there are many things going on around me now of which I am definitely *conscious*, although I am not *attending* to them—as, for example, the feeling of my clothing, the sight of the articles on my desk, the sound of hammering going on outside my window—so there are many things going on in my mind of which I am not even conscious, but which are nevertheless distinctly *mental* rather than physical;

and these things, or more properly "contents," we call subconscious.

Now the Freudians find it convenient to mark within the field of the subconscious a still further distinction between the *foreconscious* level of contents, which are near the surface, as it were, and likely to spring into full consciousness at any time, and the deeper level of the *unconscious*, whose contents are for one reason or another cut off from consciousness, and unable to manifest themselves because of some "resistance" offered to their passage upward. The examples given in the preceding paragraph will illustrate foreconscious contents, and the frequent experience of momentarily forgetting a familiar name is a classic instance of how some mental contents become "repressed," as we say, into the unconscious, and so pass for the time out of our personal ken.

The hidden motives of conduct referred to above are to be found in the unconscious, according to the theory, and the evidence derived through the various practical methods which have been established for the analysis of the mind continues to substantiate ever more and more thoroughly the general truth of the doctrine. Just as we, all of us, instinctively assume that nothing happens in nature without a natural cause (whether we acknowledge also a deeper spiritual source for natural phenomena or not), so the psychoanalyst insists that we should also assume that nothing happens in our minds without some mental cause, even should such a cause be entirely unconscious so far as our personality is concerned—and the facts are constantly transforming this assumption into empirical certainty, and so tending to establish the theory.

But why is the "unconscious" unconscious? Why is it

that the underlying motives of conduct are so often so concealed from observation that even the subject himself is unable to explain his own feelings and actions? Because, psychoanalysis finds, there is some "conflict" between these motives and our *personal* ideas or feelings. I am jealous, for example, of some friend for whom I really have a sincere admiration; jealousy is, however, an emotion against which my whole moral nature rebels; it is repressed, therefore, into my unconscious, and a resistance is set up in my fore-conscious against the conscious appearance or outward expression of my jealous emotions. The consequence usually is in such cases that my repressed jealous or antipathetic "trends" are diverted to some other person or some *thing* associated with the object of my jealousy, and the trends themselves thus find an outlet in some indirect way. I may, for example, develop an intense dislike for my friend's cook or his child, or for the arrangement of his furniture or the make of his automobile, and yet not be able to give even myself a clear and rational explanation of this dislike. The probability is that all our unaccountable likes and dislikes, prejudices and inclinations, even such religious or moral convictions as we cannot rationally defend or explain, are the indirect expressions of unconscious trends, simply by virtue of the fact that they are *not* rationally explicable. And when it comes to the phenomena of dreams, hypnosis, and hysteria the evidence of such "mechanisms" as conflict, repression, and substitution is even more overwhelming.

Now, for the sum-total of all the trends or tendencies of the unconscious, psychoanalysts use the term *libido* (a Latin word for "craving" or "intense desire"), and to the resisting force which prevents this libido from expressing itself directly the word "censor" is often figuratively ap-

plied. The fundamental conflict within the mind is, therefore a conflict between the libido or inner mental energy seeking expression, and the repressing censor which continually forces down the libido and prevents its expressing itself directly: the libido, then, if it is to find expression at all, must find it through some indirect channel. The libido, in other words, is like a cork which my hand is pressing down below the surface of the water, and my hand is the censor which resists the vertical uprising of the cork just so long as my hand remains in a horizontal position; if, however, I turn my hand even slightly away from the horizontal, the cork will soon find its way to the surface around the edge of my hand.

The fundamental problem of psychoanalysis comes down to this: What is the real nature of the *libido*, and what is the real nature of the *censor*—the two opposing forces of the mental conflict? Freud and his followers, and the protagonists of the various schools which sprang out of and have now separated themselves from the original Freudian tradition, are divided primarily on the answer to the first of these questions, and have, strangely enough, completely failed to realize the significance of the equally important second question. Certain recent writers, however, have cast considerable light on the latter half of the problem.

THE NATURE OF THE LIBIDO

As to the nature of the libido, the leading theories are associated with the names of Freud, Adler, and Jung respectively. Freud himself is noted chiefly for his identification of the libido with the *sex instinct*. According to his analysis, all the phenomena of dreams and the so-called “neuroses” (hysteria, neurasthenia, etc.), and many of the unac-

countable phenomena of everyday life (as, for example, forgetting a familiar name, slips of the tongue or pen, personal prejudices and emotional states, and the like) are expressions of this instinct, usually in some distorted form.

Naturally, it is this aspect of the Freudian doctrine which has aroused the greatest opposition in scientific as well as non-scientific circles to the entire psychoanalytic movement and its methods; to which the Freudians promptly reply that this revulsion against their views is itself a proof of their truth, and that this opposition is merely a manifestation of sexual trends in the minds of the opponents which the censor is trying vainly to conceal! Freud also endeavors to appease in some degree this opposition by insisting that he does not mean the term "sex" to be understood in its narrow physical significance alone, but in the broadest sense as including every phase of the love-life of each individual. The trouble with this defence, however, is that the more the meaning of the term is broadened the more it loses its distinctiveness, and one is rather forced either to accept the term in its narrower and objectionable meaning, or else to reject it and ask for a more accurate interpretation of what the libido really is.

There can be no doubt, I think, that the Freudian doctrine in its orthodox form is one-sided, and so inadequate. However strong the sex-instinct may be in man, and however powerful the resistances against the free expression of that instinct, it is hardly fair to attempt to interpret all conduct whose sources are hidden in sex terms. Dr. Alfred Adler, in opposition to Freud, interprets the libido in terms of the *instinct of self-assertion*, or "the will to power" as he calls it in his discipleship of Nietzsche. All phenomena inexplicable in conscious terms are, in Adler's view, the ex-

pression of a protest on the part of the subject against the thought of any inferiority in him, and an assertion of his selfhood and right to self-expression. My jealousy of my friend, for example, has not its source in any sex rivalry between us as Freud would have it, but in some quite unconscious and unadmitted fear on my part that my friend's activities may in some way interfere with my own equally unconscious and unadmitted desire to get ahead of him.

That the self-assertive instinct is, like that of sex, a powerful and often repressed motive of human conduct, no one can doubt, but our right to universalize it is as open to challenge in this case as it is in the other. The great contribution of Dr. C. G. Jung to psychoanalytic theory, for which modern psychology will ever owe him a debt of gratitude, is his so-called "*energetic conception*" of the libido. Jung would extend the term "libido" to include any strong desire or trend of the unconscious, and regards it as the psychical correlate of what the physicist calls in his field "energy." Libido is psychical energy, and all human instincts are, in this view, differentiations, or manifestations in different forms, of this one libido; just as in the physical world we now know that such things as heat, light, and electricity are not separate forces or substances, but forms of the one energy. Of the various possible forms of the libido, Jung recognizes the two powerful instincts of *nutrition*, manifesting itself in the feeling of hunger, and having the preservation of the individual as its end, and *reproduction*, manifesting itself in the feelings of sex, and having for its end the preservation of the race, to be the chief, but not the only ones.

THE NATURE OF THE "CENSOR"

Psychoanalysts, as we have seen, are more interested in the libido or expressive force of the unconscious than they

are in that other and repressive factor of the psychical conflict to which they have given the name of "censor." And yet the importance of this factor can hardly be less than that of the other. We must see what can be said on this question, and as we enter upon it let those who may wonder what all this has to do with divine grace take courage, for we are coming to the point!

In the first place we must recognize the instinctive character of the repressive as well as of the expressive factor. If I am hindered from carrying out some desire because of the intervention of some outside force or some other person or the physical impossibilities of the situation, I can hardly call the conflict a psychical one: it is only when both factors of the conflict are within the mind that this expression is appropriate, and yet according to the general psychoanalytic position, all inexplicable mental phenomena are the results of an inner conflict. But, after all, does the common grouping by biologists and psychologists of the human instincts under the two heads which Jung recognizes—self-preserved and race-preserved—exhaust all the possibilities? By no means; but it is to the sociologists that we must go for further suggestions in this matter.

Students of human nature have recognized since the time of Aristotle that man is essentially a *social animal*, and that the conduct of the individual is largely determined by the customs of the tribe or social group of which he is a part; but it has been left to a contemporary sociologist, W. Trotter, to develop most fully the psychological significance of this fact.* This third kind of innate motive Trotter calls the "herd instinct," and it has often been known as the "instinct of gregariousness." "The essential specific character

*See his *Instincts of the Herd in Peace and War*. 1915.

of the mind of the gregarious animal," says this writer, "is the capacity to confer upon herd opinion the physical energy of instinct" (*op. cit.*, p. 82). Because of the difference between the social life of man with its moral and spiritual ends and that of the lower animals with its purely physical significance, however, I propose to substitute in the former case the term "community instinct" for that proposed by Mr. Trotter.

It must be recognized, then, that one of the most potent forces behind human conduct is the force of this community instinct, and the discovery of the importance of this motive has led many students of psychoanalysis to identify the censor or repressive force entirely with the community instinct. The fundamental inner conflict of man is, according to this view, the conflict between the self-preservative and race-preservative instincts on the one hand and the social or community instinct on the other. But is this a sufficient solution of the problem? In two ways, I think, must we extend our conception of the censor as so defined and explained if we are to account for all the facts.

In the first place, psychoanalysts need to recognize more fully than they do that though the social forces are, indeed, repressive and inhibitive in their immediate influence, they may also become stimulating and constructive forces in life. The very name of "censor" over-emphasizes the negative function of that element in our nature, and fails to allow for its positive significance for human conduct. It is perfectly true that we do *not* do certain things which we should like to do because of the inhibiting force of public opinion, but is it not also true that this same "force of public opinion" may *stimulate* us to activity which if left to ourselves we should never engage in at all? The various social forces

are surely forces which not only repress conduct, but also forces through which the libido may express itself to the best advantage of the individual. In sacrificing himself for his country, for example, in defiance of the innate longing for life and comfort and in the face perhaps of family opposition, the soldier is very positively *doing* something—not merely refusing something more desirable—and not only his country, but his own immortal soul, are benefitted thereby. Some other term, then, than the purely negative “censor” must some day be invented to cover the positive function of the community instinct.

THE PLACE OF RELIGION IN PSYCHOANALYTIC THEORY

But in a still more striking way we need to widen our view of this factor, and a hint toward such a more comprehensive interpretation we find in a sentence from Dr. W. H. B. Stoddart’s recent work, *The New Psychiatry*. On page 9 of this book we read: “By far the greater majority of conflicts occur between a personal complex and a herd complex—that is to say, between morality, religion, . . . or fashion on the one hand, and nutriment, self-preservation, or sex on the other.” In other words, the over-individual forces which so often come into conflict with the purely selfish or physical interests of the individual are not merely the forces of public opinion, but forces which manifest themselves on three successive levels, of which the community instinct itself is the lowest. These three levels are (1) *convention*—the “community instinct” proper, “fashion,” “propriety,” “social pressure,” “the force of public opinion,” to cite various expressions therefor; (2) *morality*, conscience, the moral law, the idea of duty, “the sense of moral obligation”; (3) *religion*, the will of God, or the *power of divine grace*. Many things we do or refuse to do

merely because such conduct is or is not customary in our particular community or social "set," many things we do or refuse to do because we consider it right or our duty that we should or should not, and many things we do or refuse to do because we feel that God wills or does not will that we should; and in any of these cases our motives may be entirely unconscious or unknown to our personal selves.

If we now connect these two wider interpretations of the so-called "censor," we shall recognize at once, I think, that as we ascend from its lowest to its highest level its negative and repressive function becomes less and less important and its positive and constructive function more and more so. Conventionality is preëminently negative in its force, it puts a damper upon enthusiasm, upon individual initiative or originality: I must *not* say what I really think about my neighbor's taste in rugs—not because I do not wish to hurt his feelings, but because it is not "the thing" to speak frankly; I must *not* wear a straw hat after the fifteenth of September, however warm the sun, because it is not the fashion to do so. Morality has its inhibitions too, it is true, and perhaps has more inhibitions than it has maxims of a positive nature, but on the whole there are fully as many positive duties recognized by the average man as there are negative ones. But it is in the field of religion that the stimulating and constructive force of the misnamed "censor" is most marked; many religions, indeed, seem to be predominantly negative in their precepts, but not so the Catholic religion of our Lord, for it is as a dynamic force in the world that the Catholic religion was founded and today justifies its existence. Men pray, go to church, and carry on their various religious activities in these days—certainly not because it is the fashion so to do, for decidedly it is the fashion today rather to keep away from

such things—but they do so because their religion calls upon them to. Without religion, many things which we do would be left undone, but not so many things would be done which in the light of religion we have left undone.

Psychoanalytic theory and religious belief and practice are not, therefore, so far apart or so antagonistic as would appear at first glance. Because men have not recognized the reality of divine grace in their psychological speculations, it does not follow that the relation of religion to psychoanalysis is as that of Christ to Beelzebub. Rather does a full consideration of the facts of human conduct and its underlying motives lead inevitably to a recognition of spiritual forces in the world if our account of these facts and their causes is to be complete; and, on the other hand, if our religion is to be kept in harmony with our science without surrendering its eternal truths to the theories of the age which some future age may supplant, it is necessary at every step for the theologian to keep track of the more or less wobbly advance of the sciences, and connect from time to time his dogmas with the current ideas of investigators in scientific fields.

The function, then, that religion has to perform in the human mind is a positive rather than a negative, a strengthening rather than weakening, function. Without religion, the individual is dependent on his own internal resources or “will-power” either to do or to abstain from doing; but with religion, through the exercise of the spiritual forces of faith and prayer and the Catholic sacraments, the individual is enabled to take hold of the power which comes from above and to strengthen his own inner psychical energy or “libido” by the absorption of that cosmic energy which comes down from the Source of all life, and which we know as the Grace of our Lord Jesus Christ.

Why the Church Attracts Denominationalists

REV. ARTHUR G. ROBERTS

SEVERAL PRELIMINARY STATEMENTS

THE information upon which this paper is based was obtained from the statements of more than a score of priests and laymen who had come into the Church from various religious bodies. These statements were full and frank and represent men of every school of thought in the Church.

It may seem to some that the treatment of denominationism is unduly severe and critical. This is due to the purpose of the paper as well as the sources upon which it is based. When one is giving reasons why he left a religious body he would naturally stress the unfavorable facts which caused his revolt. The great majority of those questioned expressed full respect for the denominations they had left.

One must not judge denominationalism by its manifestations in the East. Here it is old and staid and affected by influences which do not obtain in other parts of our country.

According to the findings of the Church Pension Fund exactly ten percent or nearly six hundred of the clergy of the Church have entered the ministry from the ministries of other religious bodies. There is reason to believe that not more than two-thirds of those applying are received. The road is long and difficult. First of all the Bishop is usually suspicious of moral lapses or other difficulties in the previous life of the applicant and sees to it that these suspicions are cleared up before proceeding further in the matter. That this attitude is necessary any Bishop can testify.

Some most peculiar and unworthy motives are discovered as a cause for a change which signifies to many such individuals merely a change of denomination. If the applicant is able to stand this scrutiny the worst is still to come. He must become in turn a candidate for Confirmation, a Churchman, a Postulant, a Candidate, A Deacon, and finally a Priest. He must be recommended, investigated, tested, tried, and examined. This is not a criticism of the methods or Canons of the Church. The requirements are not too exacting but in some matters of detail might well be made more exacting and systematic. Neither the Church nor the individual is the gainer when one enters the Church under the impression that he is merely changing denominations or that the doctrinal differences are negligible. One tragic example of this was Bishop Cummins, a leader of the Reformed Episcopal movement. He came from the Methodists and events would seem to prove that he stopped at a point much nearer the Methodists than the Church. One priest in New England is in the habit of saying to those who come to him for advice on the subject, "Don't come in if you can stay out." This may sound somewhat harsh and uninviting but it is a good working plan if one is to avoid disaster.

We must not forget also the battle in the mind and heart of the individual in which old convictions are giving place to newer ones. Sometimes this means years of unrest and struggle. Often there is a severance of friendships. He must consider leaving a situation he understands and connections which help him for conditions he cannot understand so well and generally no connections at all.

Why then do so many make the sacrifice? What are the considerations that led thinking men, ministers and leaders

of their denominations, to break with the past and begin life over again in new and strange surroundings. We shall attempt to answer in their own words.

THE ELEMENT OF WORSHIP AND ORDERLINESS

This is placed first not because it is of first importance but because it is so often the point of departure and in the case of lay converts is almost always the beginning of an interest in the Church. The denominations may have fought once for "Liberty of Prophesying" but many of the more devout and intelligent are now becoming more willing to give it over at least in part. They are beginning to realize that it is not the highest form of public worship to listen to the private devotions of the pastor as expressed in his extemporaneous prayers. As one studies the faces of a congregation during such a prayer it becomes evident that the concern is not so much to assist or to make it a common prayer as it is to listen with interest to what is being said. This tendency is increased in prayer meetings by the natural desire of the various persons taking part to use a variety of expressions. A greater weakness develops when individuals vie with one another in expressing strong feelings or desires in exaggerated language. Cases are fairly numerous where censure or compliment is expressed through the same medium. This lack of orderliness becomes especially pronounced during revival periods. Prof. Austin Phelps, one of the giants of old Andover Seminary, writes in his essay on the Episcopal Church, "In periods of religious disorder when zeal runs away with wisdom, we find reason to prize the help of Episcopal conservatism and propriety. The late Rev. Dr. Hawes of Hartford was by temperment and training a Puritan of the Puritans. Yet

at a time of religious effervescence in Connecticut when zeal ran riot even to profaneness, he said, 'I thank God for the Episcopal Church.' We all have reason for the same thank offering when popular reverence is overborne by religious frenzy."

The lack of order and reverence in public worship is an element which turns the eyes of many towards the Church. In the past this has been all but cultivated under the impression that in some mysterious way it was emphasizing the spirit as against the letter. But the same individuals have no hesitation in saluting the flag as a symbol or in paying respect to the majesty of the law in court rooms or in giving visible and formal expression of reverence for symbols and principles in the lodge room and the same common-sense attitude is obtaining more and more in their thoughts of worship.

One person, when it became known that he was seriously thinking of entering the Episcopal Church, received a letter from a leader in his denomination in which great surprise was expressed that one who had enjoyed the blessings of spiritual worship could turn to formalism. He replied, "Instead of going into formalism I am escaping from it. Formalism does not consist in the use of forms of worship but in the use of forms which have no meaning. We have certain generally accepted orders of service but no one would claim that these have any necessary or vital meaning; and even our forms of Baptism, the Lord's Supper, Ordination, etc., are purely parabolic to say the most. At my own ordination the minister who offered the prayer offered a half apology to God for the Laying on of Hands. This is formalism. On the other hand, however many forms and ceremonies the Episcopal Church may have at least every

one of them has a real and vital meaning." The denominational leader surprised the young man by replying that to a great extent he agreed but that one with such convictions should remain and help put meaning into the empty forms. To this the young man replied that it is an impossibility since to put meaning into form involves the sacramental principle and their denomination was confessedly anti-sacramental.

A priest writes, "I think it was the fact of the reality of worship which the Church exemplifies that drew me to her." Simple, orderly, reverent, real worship is a strong attraction.

THE APPEAL OF HISTORY AND THE HISTORICAL BACKGROUND

This also is an important and powerful appeal. Many of the seeds which grow and fructify in the conversion of denominational ministers are sown in the history classrooms of their own seminaries. Even though the professors be so violently opposed to the Episcopal form of government that they cannot be fair still the facts speak for themselves. A priest of the Church in looking over some old papers found the notes he had taken in a course in history in a denominational seminary he had attended before entering the Church. He found written in the margin of one of the pages the following observation, "Is it not peculiar that Prof. Blank unhesitatingly accepts the testimony of the Fathers on the subject of the New Testament Canon while he as unhesitatingly brands all their references to the Episcopal form of government as the signs of the falling away from primitive purity and simplicity?" The Apostolical background of the Church is a noble one and quickly dwarfs the appeal to Luther, Calvin, Wesley, Browne, Huebmayr,

or Channing. Apostolic succession is so much more worthy and true than any other succession. A priest wrote, "I like the Church because back of me as a priest I feel that I have all the authority of the Christian centuries."

Aside from the historical appeal of the Church Catholic there is also the historical appeal of the Anglican Church as the Church of the English-speaking world. She is the old mother Church and her traditions and history are the traditions and history of the race. When George Thomas Dowling left the Baptists years ago for the Church a denominational paper taunted him with having left the Church of his father, who was a minister. He replied, "I have left the Church of my father for the Church of my fathers."

DOCTRINE

This is easily the most important consideration. Whatever may have been the point of departure to an interest in the Church or whatever may have been the points of dissatisfaction with denominationalism the question of doctrine should finally enter and become the deciding issue. Whatever mistakes men have made in coming into the Church have been made largely at this point. Some have been attracted by our worship or history or other such consideration but have failed to note the radical differences of doctrine. When one considers that the Church is essentially sacramental while the denominational bodies are non-sacramental if not actually anti-sacramental there is revealed at once one radical source of difference. No denomination, except possibly the Lutheran, could accept as of any real meaning our definition of a sacrament as given in the Catechism. It is interesting in this connection to compare

our Prayer Book with the Prayer Book of the Reformed Episcopalians. The many very significant changes and omissions will bear out what is said above,—and this book is in advance of some denominations.

The question of doctrine is sometimes the point of departure. In such a case one may come quite to the position of the Church without fully recognizing it or without knowing that there is a Church having such a position. Men who have revolted against sectarianism and are wavering on the brink of unbelief often find in the Church that insistence upon fact as opposed to theory which they need if they are to remain Christian. On the other hand, those who are drawing near to Romanism often find in the Church that sane and primitive Catholicism they crave.

In one case, a man had been passing through a period of spiritual and doctrinal unrest for several years and had come to certain rather ill-defined conclusions which he could not identify as being held by any religious body and which he rather feared led Romewards. Still having lost faith in the theories and emotional appeals of his denomination he was conscious of the fact that these new beliefs of his were only alternative to unbelief. One day in turning over the leaves of the encyclopaedia he came upon the heading, "Protestant Episcopal Church." His attention was arrested by the title as he wondered if it were the same as the Episcopal Church. He glanced through the article and to his astonishment discovered that here his new beliefs were reflected. A surprisingly large number of converts have had a similar experience.

The points of doctrine which most often receive attention during these times of change are the Lambeth four points: the Scriptures, the Creeds, the Sacraments, the Historic Episcopate.

The Church's use of the Bible appeals because she has a form of interpretation consisting of the primitive and authoritative understanding especially as contained in the Creeds. The private interpretation of the Holy Scriptures for doctrinal purposes has somewhat broken down through the very multitudinous and contradictory views of the same subject which it has produced. The minister becomes willing to escape this medley for he knows full well that it is difficult if not impossible to meet radical sectarians on the basis of literal quotation of Scripture. A number of years ago the leading Presbyterian minister of Pittsburgh challenged Pastor Russell to a debate and on the basis of literal quotation of Scripture was worsted, and to this day the Russellites are distributing great numbers of reports of this debate containing everything said on both sides. One New England pastor met this issue in his town more successfully by an appeal to the historical interpretation of Scripture. But he was caught in his own trap for when he applied the principle consistently it landed him in the Church. One man who had become interested in the Episcopal Church was charged with going to Rome and his accuser emphasized the ill results of unlimited Roman domination. He replied, "I admit everything you say about the Roman Church. But from present indications what would be the result were sectarianism to have unlimited sway for several centuries. What would be the result of its doctrine of the right of every man to neglect the Creeds and historical doctrines and to make his own creed and doctrines. Would it not be reasonable to suppose that religion would be lost in Russellism or like fantastical forms or in Spiritualism or other forms of devil worship or in Unitarianism or other forms of unbelief?"

The complementary truth of the comprehensiveness of the Church and the freedom of thought in matters not essential was also mentioned appreciatively by several. It is as important in its place as the fixed standards are in theirs.

Much is said by denominationalists about their simple gospel and their simple beliefs but when these terms are explained we find them to be fairly complete epitomes of systematic theology. All have lengthy theological confessions of faith. These are largely theories as for instance that of the Atonement. The simple statements of facts in the Creeds draw with great power. One convert said, "As I was being confirmed it seemed as if old dry theories were rolling off my shoulders."

The sacraments appeal because of their definiteness and powers of assurance. Beyond the outward and visible sign there is the inward and spiritual reality which is given unto us. It is a definite means and an unfailing pledge. How simple and satisfying this is to one who has been trying to achieve the same results through prayer meetings. We read of the early efforts of the Evangelicals to have prayer meetings and how these gradually disappeared. This was not because of opposition but because of the fact that the Church already had definite and simple means of achieving personal communion with God and the assurance of His pardoning grace. The prayer meeting and prayer-meeting elements really take the place in the denominational world that the sacraments take in the Church. Some time ago this view was expressed to a loyal Methodist minister. He agreed with it and added the rather surprising statement that with the decline of the prayer meeting the people are tending in the direction of a more definite sacra-

mental approach to God. As this tendency has played so large a part in the conversion of denominationalists so it may have a part in the reunion of Christendom.

We have already touched upon the Historic Episcopate and have noted its weight in turning men to the Church. The practical working out of that policy did not receive so much favorable mention. One spoke of it as a deterrent to religious Bolshevism. Another was surprised to discover that the Church is more democratic than the denomination from which he came. It is safe to make the assertion that many elements in the practical workings of the Church are not widely or strongly attractive to those without but might be so were Episcopal polity carried out consistently.

Three other minor considerations emerged in the study of this subject. While these are not of first importance still they operate strongly in individual cases.

Trifling Moral Distinctions. In sectarian meetings one hears much of dancing, card playing, theatre attendance, and the use of tobacco. Especially at revival time there is much declaiming on these subjects. One denomination requires its ministers to sign two obligations before ordination. One of these is that he will not use tobacco. Still some of these same ministers do not scruple to disregard the plain words of our Saviour in regard to marriage of divorced persons. It is easy and perhaps proper to become disgusted with these petty regulations and look with longing to a Church which places the emphasis upon the weightier matters of the law. It does not lessen the disgust to discover that these rules do not serve any good purpose. One priest writes, "I got tired of the continual tirade against smoking, card playing, dancing and theatre going, as if Christian citizenship and achievement consisted simply of

not doing these things." These rules can be accounted for by the fact that denominationalism is strongly influenced by Gnostic Dualism.

Early Training. About one in four of those interviewed had had some experience in the Church or in the Church of England in earlier years. We have been thinking of our gains. This emphasizes the fact that we are also having serious losses. While early training operates to reclaim many we should not delude ourselves by thinking that it always does so.

Natural-born Churchmen. Some extracts from a note written by a priest covers this point completely. "I was born in the M. E. Church but early in life I found I was a child of the M. E. Church in name only. I went through my academic and theological training not knowing I had a real spiritual home. Through a clergyman of the Church when I had been a Methodist minister for two years I became interested in the teachings of the Episcopal Church. There were no doubts, no questions. Some Church people are born, not made. I have found since becoming a clergyman of the Church that like myself there are a great many born Church people in the denominations."

These are some of the ways the Church attracts. And it is certain that if the Church were presented properly many more would come in. A short time ago while preparing a Roman Catholic for reception into the Church, he exclaimed, "Why, I never knew that there was such a Church that could give me Catholicism without the Romanism." He was asked, "What would Roman Catholics in general do if they understood the matter?" He answered, "They would come in droves." Our presentation of the truth must be consistent and positive. Either this is true or it is false.

Either the system is dependable for the salvation of souls or it is not dependable. If it appears to us in any wise false or not dependable let us be manly enough to renounce our ministry and quit. If it be true and dependable let us present it positively, unreservedly, and confidently.

The Perennial Heresy of Opportunism

BY MARLINSPIKE.

THERE seem to be extraordinarily few people who do not concur in the modern idea that the world has made great "progress" since what is vaguely and darkly referred to as the Middle Ages. Such a theory, in all its fullness, can be held by a materialist only, for while there are unquestioned and unquestionable advances in many ways, the greatest advance is in the direction of strikingly material things,—matters of comfort and convenience and (like the telephone) of ultimate annoyance. The spirit is hemmed in by the complexity of the world in which it lives, a world so completely and engrossingly pleased with itself (in spite of grumblers) that escape from its insidious materialism is almost impossible. It is a phase of parlor-car civilization,—upholstered, expensive, intolerably stuffy. The largeness of spirit which made men great sinners and great saints is gone; true, there are compensations, but they are compensations toward the meaner side of man's nature,—the side which will compromise or even sacrifice principle for the sake of peace and quiet; the side which measures effort by material success. Now all this is a truism and has been stated with infinite skill by Mr. Ches-

terton ("Heretics," Chapter I, "The Negative Spirit.") and many others. But a slight comprehension of the theory that progress, so called, is a succession of phases,—some good, some bad,—is essential to an understanding of the fact that the world, and the Church, seem in a state of perpetual crisis. I believe that if one questioned the average person of one's acquaintance, one would elicit a general conception that the eighteenth century was better than the fourteenth, simply because the world had "progressed" four hundred years. As well say that one should prefer a pimply young blackguard of seventeen to a healthy effervescent young animal of thirteen simply because seventeen was older than thirteen, and in four years the lad had learned to smoke, to swear, or to lie in bed of a Sunday! As well say that the eighteenth amendment to the constitution is better than the fourteenth because it is newer, or because fourteen from eighteen leaves four, or for any other inconsequent reason. Each phase of history should be considered, not by its position on the world's calendar, but by its effort to secure the coming of the kingdom of God on earth. Surely the most elementary conception of God as an infinite Being removes any idea of the importance of the time when an event occurs. If one imagines God as the center of a circle the circumference of which is time, the matter is perfectly clear. Every point on that circumference is equally near the center (which is God), so what possible difference can it make if we label this sector the twentieth century and another the twelfth century? But it does make a difference if we think that merely because we are number twenty, we are superior to number twelve. There may be reasons why we *are* superior to this or that age, but they are not reasons of mere mathematics.

All this brings us back to the assertion that we have lost a certain largeness of spirit in this day and generation. Our Lord's parable of the house ("swept and garnished") has always made a vivid appeal to the imagination. If one pictures the soul as a room, what kind of a room would one prefer to have? A vast, noble Gothic hall, with space for the assemblies of knights and knightly ideas, where high revels or solemn rites may be held? Even filled with robber barons, such a hall commands respect and reluctant admiration. But isn't the modern room rather more like the back parlor of a delicatessen shop,—full of easy chairs and stuffed furniture and bric-a-brac and what-nots? When a really robust idea, like a healthy child, gets loose in such a room, he smashes some cherished (if valueless) heirloom and we thrust him out into the yard, and go back to frowst in our cosy little study.

Granted that the age is not entirely ignoble; that there have been petty, mean-spirited men in all ages; that smallness of view in matters of the spirit and keenness of eye in matters of the pocketbook have appeared before in the history of the world and of the Church: does not even a superficial view of the last nineteen centuries support the claim that no one century is superior to another merely because of its advanced position on the calendar? If we accept this premise, we can understand that this state of perpetual crisis is the effort of each phase to justify itself. Where crises are composed of the clash of human wills, the cowardly and the reckless, the procrastinating and the fearless, the guileful and the wise, evolve in some sort of mixture the resulting facts. Nowadays there is a tendency to consider the broadly tolerant, the weakly easy-going, and the ignorantly kind, as models of wisdom and discretion. The zealous, the

over-enthusiastic, the unduly devout, are treated (in our Church at least) with suspicion and coolness. The entire tendency of the age is in that direction,—toward toleration bordering on fatuity. Any attack on this amazing idea is “bigotry.” Mind you, the idea is not merely that people have a right to believe what they like, but it is that *whatever they believe is right!* Professor Root, in his splendid *Atlantic* article, “The Virtue of Intolerance,” combats this theory. He says:

“Have I not a right to my own opinion? and if so, mere generosity must accord the same right to my neighbor. It is an interesting case of casuistry, this supposed right to one’s own opinion. I suspect that its loudest asserters seldom stop to ask what sort of right they are talking about. If they mean legal right, the answer is simple. The most ruthless minions of the most despotic government cannot keep me from holding what opinion I please, so long as I also hold my tongue; the law can challenge only the utterance of opinion.”

“If by ‘right’ one means not legal but absolute right, as established by abstract Justice in the high court of Truth, the liberty of private judgment is not so wide. One can have no absolute right to any opinion except a true opinion; one can have no right to believe that two and two make five, or even four and a half. In matters of less demonstrable finality, the right to my own opinion presupposes that I have taken into account all the evidence, that I have the requisite skill to sift it and the knowledge to weigh it. Many people go through life without the right to form their own opinion on any matter of more weight than the probable formula of a salad-dressing or a new cocktail—and this latter opinion is now becoming a question of merely scholastic abstraction! The only man with a right to an opinion is the expert; and in any matter that we consider really important, we seek his opinion, and acknowledge its superior worth by paying roundly for it. Sensible people quietly abdicate the right to their own opinion when it is a question of estimating the strain of a cantilever span or of ordering a capital operation. They prefer

to exercise their 'right' only in matters of less serious moment, such as the League of Nations or the immortality of the soul." . . .

The above is profoundly true of the Anglican Church. This inane theory of the world, that one must be tolerant of everything except intolerance, has bitten deep into the mind of the Church. The headmaster of a Church School had rather engage as master a lukewarm Presbyterian than a man whom he suspected of being a "ritualist." One may have that chronic spiritual constipation known as "agnosticism" but one must not believe that the Blessed Sacrament should be adored. Lack of conviction is safe, in other words, but explicit belief is dangerous.

Is the extraordinarily uninspiring aspect of the men who make up the priesthood the cause or result of this attitude? It is difficult to say, but it seems more reasonable to say that they are the result. As long as the clergy are underpaid; as long as they abandon principles to retain their jobs; as long as weak men are elected to high offices because the poor-spirited are afraid of strong men, just so long shall we have the heresy of opportunism flourishing in our front garden for the world to see.

And the saddest part of this uninspired and uninspiring type is that they are treated as the truly wise of the Church. Without red blood enough to teach positively this or that as true and necessary to salvation, they are injecting the virus of vagueness and opportunism into the priesthood and into the Church through the seminaries. Doctrinal teaching which may be taken in two diametrically opposite ways; apologetics which teach that the goal of life is happiness (how, when or where left unexplained), and that prayer is a subjective exercise; exegesis which bends its efforts toward destroying whatever faith in miracles, the virgin

birth and other manifestations of the supernatural the candidate has,—all these and worse are not only tolerated but sanctioned. This may sound extreme. But look at the results, and you must have a suspicion that there is something rotten in the state of Denmark. One class of students at a great seminary were taught that one must not accept things simply on the say-so of a person called "Matthew." But because a neurotic German could not believe certain things possible, one must take his (the German's) word that they didn't happen. Perhaps there are a few of us left who do not care to take a German's word for anything. The German mind has shown itself fully capable of wantonly pulling the wings off butterflies—mentally, morally and spiritually. Men from German prison camps tell with a certain deplorable vividness how this trait extended into their physical treatment. But a hundred years from now the lineal descendants of our "higher critics" will not care to accept the report of these eye-witnesses (low-calibre men, many of them,—not very well educated) and will be "taking the word" of the latest German explanation of the matter.

It did not require a war to explode for most of us the German theories of politics and religion; however, the war came, and has gone on, and yet a professor in one of our Eastern seminaries advises his more intelligent students to take "a couple of years in Germany"! In God's name, why? To be missionaries? Not a bit of it; to bring back the destructiveness, the foulness, the intolerable conceit of theologians who say "The Evangelists and the Saints and the Church are all wrong—I alone know how it all happened."

As long as seminaries harbor this sort of thing; as long as students are advised not to associate themselves with any

“group,” as it may spoil their chances for a rich parish (“don’t be extreme” is the slogan); as long as the enthusiastic young militant Christian with a soul on fire for God’s cause and a welter of plastic ideas in his head is frowned on and a vague sort of spiritual *moron* is held up as the ideal,—just so long will the clergy be merely the insipid reflection of the age in which they live, rather than the leaders of the vanguard of the armies of God. Is your priest as fine a type of man as your doctor? Did it ever occur to you that while your doctor went to a medical school governed by vigilant experts, to be taught what to do by practical instructors, your priest (if he be the rule and not the happy exception) was struggling toward his crystalization of religious thought through a morass of doubts and destructive theories, of unrelated and inconsequent scholarship, of inadequate instruction in the instruments of the Church (the sacraments) and at every turn was assailed by influences which sought to nullify positiveness and substitute vagueness and euphemism and opportunism. Not that over-zealousness and high spirits do not need discipline; on the contrary, they must be properly disciplined in order to teach and lead effectively, but the steel should be fashioned into a tempered blade, not reduced to a puddle of dull metal. Naturally none of our seminaries are wholly bad,—but if they are not the spring-head from which the Church is being infected, one does not know where to look.

We are in the usual state of crisis through which the Church must pass in each phase of the world’s history. We failed to justify ourselves in the war, we let slip an opportunity which, please God, will never return. Now, with the world never so turbulent, with the muck and scum of every

harbor stirred up and floating on the surface, we are talking of abandoning principles, of compromise which is not compromise but surrender, and we are keeping as heads and instructors in some of our seminaries the last people in the world to handle any nettle with a strong grip. It is not a new experience for the Church, but, thanks to the present era, we are less able to combat it than before. If the trumpet call of revolt and reform were sounded and heeded, it would mean strong measures; feelings would be hurt; friendships would be broken; and an immense home for indigent doctors in divinity would have to be established. And of course we must not do anything so extreme; no well-bred bishop would dream of advocating anything so upsetting. With our back to the wall, with our creed attacked by those whom we have called "brother," we still but reflect the aenemic spirit of the phase in which we live. Like the undergraduate "rag" pictured in E. F. Benson's "Robin Linnet," where one boy lies on the floor with another boy seated on his stomach preparing to torture him, we cry from our prostrate position, "Whatever we are, let us be dignified. . . . And calm. . . . Calm. . . . And dignified". . .

Are we too enmeshed in the meaningless broadmindedness of the day to heed a call to arms? Must we continue to discount zeal and enthusiasm and courage unless it be in the direction of material gain or radically destructive criticism? Have we none of that generosity of spirit which makes us explorers and soldiers and navigators, which sees life, not as a drowsy afternoon in a comfortable room but as a crystal "many-faceted to adventure"?

Some Reflections on a Pamphlet

REV. JOHN COLE MCKIM, M.A., B.D.

I DO not know to what circumstance or circumstances I am indebted for the receipt of a small pamphlet entitled "Portrait of a Diocese" which a leisurely postal service has just conveyed to me. It may have been sent to the clergy generally; it may have been sent to me in particular because some recent comments of my own upon the Oxford Movement have caught the critical eye of the pamphleteer; or it may be because it is as much a pleasure to him as it is a happiness to me to remember that we were undergraduates together at the same well known college.

However that may be, the pamphlet is here and I have read it through with some sympathy and a great deal of amazement. The pamphlet was written while the author was apparently smarting from a sense of genuine grievance. In the Diocesan Synod of May, 1919, he had voted in the negative to a proposal to increase the Bishop's salary to \$5000.00 per annum. He was one of three persons to vote against the increase, both *viva voce* and on a rising vote. In spite of this fact, the minutes of the Synod were worded in such a manner as to suggest that the motion had been passed unanimously. This, if I have understood the facts correctly, constitutes a gross injustice. I do not know the dissenters' reasons for opposing the increase of so modest an episcopal salary. The writer of the pamphlet tells us no more than that he "gave his voice and vote against it conscientiously." But it belongs to the very essence of justice that a synod or convention shall be in fact what it is ostensibly,—a place where those who enjoy the suffrage may cast their votes and (if entitled to the floor) raise their voices,

with unquestioned freedom. And the records of such gatherings should record the vote as given. It would have been pleasant, doubtless, could this increase in the salary of the chief pastor (I note that he is the married successor of a celibate) have been unanimously voted, but for the minutes not to record three votes persistently cast in the negative would be a gross falsification of records without any sort of palliation or excuse. Sentimental considerations cannot be allowed any weight here. Recent tendencies in America are threatening the due rights of minorities and church gatherings should move *against*, not *with* this particular stream. It is the more deplorable that an offence such as is common enough elsewhere, should be laid at the door of the synod of a diocese conspicuous for its fidelity to the true faith "as this Church hath received the same." It is the more noticeable for being a smudge on a fair record.

The writer of the pamphlet, then, has a real grievance of which to complain. He had a right and even, I dare say, a duty to protest against that grievance. So far, he has my sincere sympathy. It accompanies him no further, for it seems to me that he has no proper idea of what allegiance to the Catholic Church involves nor of the conditions which tend to conserve liberty in society. About a quarter of the pamphlet is devoted to recording the experience to which I have referred. Then come two amazing sentences which I quote in full. (p. 5 of the pamphlet.)

"This experience forced me to face an ugly fact, and that was, that despite our high pretension of authority, that authority is used to stifle, thwart and distort democratic expression."

"Thus I came to consider with you the social significance of the Oxford Movement."

Much has been alleged of the Oxford Movement, but the ingenuity which can connect it (the word "Thus" plainly implies the connection) with that injustice to small minorities, which constitutes a deplorable characteristic of so many parliamentary and other gatherings in this country, is truly amazing:—but not more so than the mind that can be satisfied with the matter which, in the subsequent pages of the pamphlet, is adduced as evidence of the truth of the proposition that the Oxford Movement is "essentially undemocratic in its social point of view, and this, largely because of the divine right theory inherent in the fiction of Apostolical Succession." (p. 5)

To the ordinary mind it would seem that the above contention depends for much of its validity on the writer's ability to show that apostolical succession is a "fiction." Perhaps he possesses that ability but, so far as this pamphlet is concerned, he apparently expects his readers to concede the point without argument. Nor does he show how "the fiction of Apostolical Succession" involves a theory of divine right. For this reason it is not clear whether our writer objects to some particular form of that theory or whether it is his bold (if unsupported) contention that divine right (and, I suppose, divinity as well) is as much a fiction as apostolical succession. Would he hold the Oxford Movement responsible for all three "fictions?"

It is, in one sense, futile to attempt any answer to such contentions. It is futile to argue with an opponent who suggests that we do not ourselves truly believe in the contentions we make; that we will, if we are honest, concede without argument that apostolical succession is a fiction. But it is interesting to note that, even granting these too generous premises, the writer's principal indictment of the Catholic system is that it is undemocratic.

And even in this we are disappointed. The term "democratic" is not defined for us. And what could be less satisfactory than the employment without definition of a word which has become the cant expression of those who appear to be trying to make the world safe for hypocrisy? We must look to the context for material suggestive of our writer's use of the word.

And here new surprises await us. We are referred to two writers for our evidence that the Oxford Movement was "essentially undemocratic." These writers are Charles Kingsley and Cardinal Newman. In the case of the latter we are referred to a particular work,—"*Apologia Pro Vita Sua*." Concerning this work we observe that (1) it was written long after Newman had ceased to be connected with the Oxford Movement and (2) that it was evoked by Charles Kingsley's aspersion of Newman's character and itself necessarily begins by questioning Kingsley's good faith. Our pamphleteer, then, refers us to two authorities standing outside the Oxford Movement, one of them its bitter (and if Newman be right) unscrupulous opponent, each of them suspicious of the other's good faith. Surely, with the wealth of material, easily accessible, coming from those connected with the Movement, our pamphleteer has made a curious selection of references.

Perhaps our writer relies upon a quotation from the "*Apologia*" in which Newman admits that he thought the French revolution unchristian in casting off sovereigns who had a divine right of inheritance. (P. 14 of the pamphlet). This youthful opinion of Newman's was held by a vast majority of the young men of his class, was the current political doctrine of a great party in parliament, and was associated with the Oxford Movement in no way whatever. It has some

points of contact with that Erastianism with which the disciples of the Oxford Movement often came into conflict, but it is a matter of history that, as the Catholic movement has gathered impetus, many of its adherents have been noted for the liberal character of their political ideas, though, as a religious movement, it is not directly concerned with secular politics. On its religious side, it has been conspicuously successful in evangelizing the poor. On the other hand, the early opponents of the movement were often Erastians and aristocrats of a peculiarly unlovable type.

Our pamphleteer is chary of historical references in support of his so emphatic assertions. Considering the nature of these assertions, this was the way of wisdom and he has been singularly unfortunate in his principal if not, indeed, his single departure from it. For the particular incident to which he refers us is the Jerusalem Bishopric.

Since opposition to the Jerusalem Bishopric project is cited in evidence to prove the anti-democratic character of the Oxford Movement, it necessarily follows that our author regards that project as democratic. That a proposal to subject the spirituality to an even greater degradation than the eighteenth century had witnessed, and to compel it to serve the political ends of the Prussian and British governments, should be described as democratic, gives, I think, the final *coup* to that term as an intelligible expression.

So much for our pamphleteer. His little work is as typical of the Protestantizing Churchman as the *Menace* and *The American Issue* have been of American Protestantism. There are people who would deny this. Only lately an acquaintance claiming to belong to "the intellectual wing of the prohibitionist party" denounced *The American Issue*, and I know that there are Protestants who would gladly disown

The Menace. But I know of no other religious paper which has enjoyed so wide a circulation. Of no other Protestant publication has it ever happened that three anonymous benefactors subscribed to it in my name. At least, that is how, venturing a guess, I account for the regular delivery of three copies of the *Menace* at my door during my last year of residence in the United States.

II.

What do we mean by religious liberty. I understand this term to connote at least two things, viz: (a) that every individual has a right to his religious convictions and to give them expression and (b) that every religious body has a right to publish and maintain its teachings.

To a limited extent, religious liberty under both these heads can be exercised in the United States, and as the law now stands, it is generally true that these limitations are only such as are necessary to conserve public order and a modicum of liberty to all. (Mormons might mention what they consider an exception to this,—also Moslems). An effort has been made, in at least some parts of the United States, to forbid to Catholics the use of what they believe to be valid matter in the sacrament of the altar but no such prohibition has as yet obtained secure standing in civil law.

An individual has the right, under our laws, to believe anything or nothing concerning religion; to belong to any or to no religious organization, with the sole limitation that he must conform to the requirements laid down by the organization in which he desires to obtain or retain membership. This last limitation is absolutely necessary if the freedom of the religious body is to be safeguarded as well as that of the individual.

Bearing this principle in mind, it is easy to see the absurdity of the contention that "heresy trials" are an interference with religious liberty. The religious liberty guaranteed under our laws to the individual citizen cannot possibly carry with it the privilege of retaining membership in an organization (still less on the teaching or ministerial staff of a denomination) while flouting its rules and publicly disputing its teachings. No one questions the right of the individual to disbelieve these teachings or to proclaim his disbelief, but to forbid the Church to deprive him of his membership or official standing would be to deprive the Church of the religious liberty which our laws confer as much upon her as upon the individual.

It is a curious fact that a disproportionately large part of the illogical invective, which denounces as an interference with freedom of conscience, the inherent right of a religious body to self purgation, is directed against the body known in law as THE PROTESTANT EPISCOPAL CHURCH IN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA. No doubt this is partly because a Church possessing Catholic formularies *is* so known in law. Unquestionably this goes far to account for the vociferous astonishment and oracular indignation voiced by many of those outside of and unfamiliar with the Church when they find that its *regular* processes of discipline can be set in motion only against those who (if not accused of "errors of life" are guilty of errors in doctrine which Protestants do not regard as errors of a serious character or which some of their sects actually teach as truths; while, on the other hand, no teaching of the Catholic Faith, however emphatic, renders a priest liable to any regular discipline however much this fact may be obscured by occasional abuses of authority and personal persecution on the

part of bishops with Protestant leanings. Or, again, our faulty system of teaching the young the truths of religion provides us with a large body of laymen whose religious convictions and utterances are of the same nebulous character as that which distinguishes the Protestants with whom they are thrown in contact. Another factor which we cannot ignore is that this faultiness in teaching the young is not wholly a matter of system (or lack of system) but is due to the unwillingness of a certain faction of the clergy to instruct their people in the truths which they are sworn to teach. For instance, in the pamphlet which we criticised at length in the first part of this paper, exception is taken to two things, viz: (1) The title page of the Diocesan Synod Journal describes this church as Catholic, and (2) the franchise in the author's diocese is granted to "All baptized persons of full age who . . . * shall declare themselves *bona fide* worshipers of the Triune God."

The author (himself a priest) deplores this rule, not (as one might expect) because of the laxity of the requirement but because it displays, to use his own words (p. 12) "the tendency to insist upon a declaration of definite theological orthodoxy." Of course, the Prayer Book repeatedly calls for much fuller declarations of theological orthodoxy. This does not render a special declaration on the part of an applicant for the franchise superfluous, but, in the eyes of those who are familiar with the obligations assumed at his Baptism, Confirmation and Ordination, it places the priest who objects to the declaration under suspicion of desiring to undermine the religion which he has sworn to teach. Naturally such clergymen incline to the "liberal" view which ob-

*The hiatus in the quotation relates to required contributions,—a requirement to which the writer of the pamphlet utters no objection.

jects to heresy trials, and those Protestants who come in contact with the Church naturally sympathize with these clergymen who are (often self-confessed) Protestants at heart. This hatred of heresy trials not only enables them to profess a liberal attitude which, where it prevails, saves them the just consequences of their own disloyalty, but it gives color to their suggestion that loyal Catholics are as much "extremists" as themselves; and their dislike of *prosecution* does not extend to *persecution* when, as sometimes happens, they find themselves in a position to bring pressure to bear upon certain "*bona fide* worshipers of the Triune God." They are not even ashamed to appeal to the Prayer Book as laying down a maximum limitation upon devotion (which it plainly does not do) while resenting a declaration, such as the one quoted above, which falls far short of its minimum requirements.

That a Roman Catholic priest who denied the "Triune God" or even suggested that the Catholic Church should tolerate such denial would be called upon for a retraction, and, failing that, would be deposed and excommunicated is almost as certain as tomorrow's sun. Yet, he would receive but little sympathy from the community at large; whereas the deposition of one of our own priests upon conviction after trial of a similar denial, would be the signal for a large chorus of protest both within and without the church.

If it were known that the process was as regular and logical in the one case as in the other, outsiders would spare themselves and us much of this invective, and those churchmen who indulged in it would stand self-convicted of disloyalty and dishonesty. For, however much the man in the street may dislike and distrust Catholic teaching, his ideas of what constitutes common honesty prevent him from ex-

tending any sympathy to the man who, enjoying a position and perquisites contingent upon his fulfilling certain duties and proclaiming certain teachings, tries to retain the emoluments of his position while shirking those duties and denying those teachings; just as even some prohibitionists might look askance at a man who, receiving a salary as the agent of a brewery, went about secretly urging people not to purchase the product of his principals.

The man in the street takes this attitude to the disloyal Roman priest because he is quite clear that the Roman Church teaches "dogmas" and "superstitions" and "orthodoxy" and other things to which, as a good Protestant, he is opposed. Therefore, the Roman priest who tries to retain his position and standing although he has come to disbelieve in these "dogmas," these "superstitions" and this "orthodoxy" has placed himself in a position which is as much in violation of the plain business ethics which the man-in-the-street understands as of ecclesiastical regularity. Consequently while he would welcome the priest's voluntary renunciation of his ecclesiastical allegiance and the position which was his by virtue of that allegiance, he eyes him askance so long as he plays the game popularly described as the "double cross."

The frank dislike which the man-in-the-street often entertains for the Roman Catholic Church is as nothing to the peculiar disgust with which, in many instances, he is coming to regard "The Episcopal Church." This is probably peculiarly true as regards what he vaguely describes as "High Church." Where this is the case the reason is to be sought in the fact that (a) the "High Church" bears a close resemblance to "the Catholics" whom he frankly dislikes and yet (b) does not "come right out and join the 'Catholics'" and (c) he never knows, going from town to town and from rector to

rector, just what he will be told as to the teaching of that church, but he *does* know that the word Protestant has been applied to that church and he does *not* know that, when first applied, the term had a connotation different to the meaning which it conveys to his mind. Consequently he is inclined to believe his low church friends when they tell him that the "High Church" with their Creeds and their Dogmas and their Sacraments, their Litanies, their Churchings, their Orderings of Priests possessing the right to pronounce absolution, their "fiction" that, from the Apostles' time there have been these orders in Christ's Church, and (he knows not how many) other things peculiar to Catholics, are really workers of innovation in a Protestant sect to whose traditions all these things are essentially foreign.

It will not be necessary for me to tell the readers of the *American Church Monthly* where the real disloyalty to the traditional teaching enshrined in our formularies is to be sought.

But, in closing, I do wish to emphasise the fact that those who desire the restoration of discipline in the Episcopal Church are actuated by no mean persecuting spirit. The age in which it was within the power of ecclesiastical courts to infringe upon that liberty of conscience which is guaranteed to the citizen of the modern state (if there ever was such an age) is long since past. Ecclesiastical discipline is necessary to conserve the Church's own religious liberty (equally guaranteed) to proclaim unequivocally its own teachings. It is the opponents, not the protagonists of ecclesiastical discipline, who would abuse this liberty and who rely upon the persecution which an appeal to an uninformed and sometimes wilfully misled public sentiment renders, in some quarters, possible.

In the restoration of discipline an important caution must be observed. "The weighty things of the law" must come first. It was not helpful to the restoration of ecclesiastical discipline when, a few years ago, a group of devout religious was driven from the Church when, in the opinion of a single bishop, their acts of devotion were in excess of limitations imposed by an ambiguous rubric; while, at the same time, cardinal points of the faith were being aspersed by prominent ecclesiastics one of whom has since been elevated to the English episcopate. It does not advance the cause of discipline when, in the American Church a bishop can publicly threaten with deprivation a priest against whom no canonical offence is alleged because he publicly recites an invocation which has ages of Catholic tradition behind it, while it is possible for another priest to publish broadcast objections to the requirement that full recognition as members of the Church can not be extended to those who are not baptized worshipers of the Triune God.

We must not be put off with the objection that heresy trials are illiberal and uncharitable. Mercy and justice are of more importance than a spurious liberality. The opponents of prosecution are often participants in persecution. A mere reference to its formularies cannot be urged as conclusive evidence of the loyally Catholic character of an organization. So long as its laxity of discipline leads to the persecution of those who are loyal to its formularies, it occupies a most dubious position. The Church must extend its protection to its loyal ministers; and this it cannot do unless it expels from its membership those who persistently deny or minimize its cardinal teachings, and who employ, towards the uninformed, the wiles of the demagogue in order to persecute their more loyal brethren.

The Nicene Creed: an Impassable Barrier

REV. ERNEST PUGH

THAT there are many difficulties in the way of the "Proposed Concordat" even the strongest of its supporters are willing to admit. The question of its relation to Catholic faith and practice may be debatable and existing canons may, without doubt, be changed. There seems to be, however, one difficulty that has been overlooked. At the last General Convention the Church declared its willingness to initiate action that may make possible the ordination of ministers of other Christian bodies who accept (1) The Scriptures, (2) The Nicene Creed, (3) The Two Sacraments.

Consciously or unconsciously that Convention has put the greatest barrier in the way of the Concordat. The crucial question is "What does the Church mean by *accept*?" Are we simply going to ask the candidate if he accepts the Nicene Creed and make no inquiry as to his interpretation of certain things within that creed? An examination of that creed from the Protestant standpoint will best set forth the danger in which we shall be placed if ordination is granted to ministers of other Christian bodies on the basis proposed by the Convention of 1919. It might be well to state here that the writer of this article was for ten years a Methodist minister; the son and grandson of Methodist preachers, and trained in two theological seminaries of that denomination.

In matters of doctrine, ritual and church polity the Methodist Church comes nearest to our own. It would be a

natural conclusion that we might eventually find more applications for ordination from that body than from any other, and that we should find less difficulty in applying the conditions for such ordination in their case than in any other. If there should be insurmountable difficulties from a doctrinal standpoint in the case of Methodists it is safe to say that those difficulties would be increased with denominations even farther removed from the doctrine and practices of the Church.

In the Methodist Ritual, which is a very close adaptation of the Book of Common Prayer, the Nicene Creed is nowhere found. The Nicene Creed is not used by Protestants. This is not due to its being longer and harder to learn or use than the Apostles' Creed. The reason of its rejection is in the theological nature of the creed itself.

We should find little or no difficulty in interpretation of the Nicene Creed until we come to the *Incarnatus*. The Methodists nominally hold to the doctrine of the Virgin Birth, but it is noteworthy that in both the seminaries mentioned that subject was very weakly dealt with. Shall we consider it a satisfactory acceptance of the creed that the candidate should remind us that the word for Virgin used by Isaiah and quoted by St. Matthew was the word "*almah*"—young woman, and not the word "*bethulah*,"—a virgin proper?

We come to the real difficulties towards the end of the creed: difficulties which have excluded the Nicene Creed from Protestantism.

"And I believe one Catholic and Apostolic Church: I acknowledge one Baptism for the remission of Sins."

Taking the latter first and examining the Methodist ritual one will discover that all references to Baptismal Regen-

eration or the New Birth are studiously avoided. Without exception all Protestants deny Baptismal Regeneration. Universally to a Protestant the New Birth means conversion. Baptism has nothing to do with the remission of sins or of making the one baptized a member of the Church of Christ. Following the order of Baptism in the Methodist Ritual are two forms of admission into membership in the Methodist Church. The first is an admission on probation, the second admits one into actual membership. Baptism means nothing more than an act of dedication. In the case of infants the parents dedicate their child to the service of Christ; in the case of an adult it is a personal act. The writer has heard leading Methodist theologians, both in the United States and Canada as well as in the Wesleyan Church in England, say that the one impassable barrier between Methodists and the Anglican Communion is that "erroneous" doctrine of Baptismal Regeneration. It is safe to say that, if the point were carefully urged, no Protestant minister accepts, in any real sense of the word, "One Baptism for the Remission of Sins."

The late Dr. W. N. Clark, Professor of Christian Theology in Colgate University, devotes fourteen pages of his "Outline of Christian Theology" to the subject of Regeneration and not once in those pages—in fact not in his whole book——does he refer to Holy Baptism.

More explicit is Dr. Henry C. Sheldon of Boston University in his "System of Christian Doctrine" for he says:

"In the first days of Christianity, baptism was coincident ordinarily with a religious crisis. Immediately upon the exercise of faith in the person and saving office of Christ it was administered as the proper expression of that faith and the seal of discipleship. . . . Under a different order of conditions, where the new life initiated by

faith is not commonly coincident with the era of baptism, it has properly a less intimate association with regeneration. To make baptism distinctly the instrument or occasion of regeneration, under a scheme which commonly interposes an interval between self-surrendering faith in Christ and the administration of the rite, is to banish faith utterly from the primacy which the New Testament accords to it in the appropriation of salvation. In fact it is given no more positive association with regeneration than is the ministry of the Word; so that it would be just as proper and scriptural to limit regeneration to an occasion of sermon-hearing as to limit it to an occasion of baptism."

In another place he says:

"That the same Christ, who rebuked the ceremonial scrupulosity and littleness of the Pharisees, . . . meant to represent the renewing operation of the Spirit as bound to a ceremonial use of water is simply inconceivable."

The late Dr. John Shaw Banks of Headingly College, Leeds, England, in his "Manual of Christian Doctrine," has one whole paragraph under the caption of "Baptismal Regeneration." He writes:

"In the Baptismal form of the Prayer-Book the minister says, 'Seeing now that this child is regenerate,' and again 'We give thee hearty thanks that it hath pleased thee to regenerate this infant with thy Holy Spirit,' words which exclude the lower sense sometimes given to the term as simple reception to outward Church privileges. Scripture recognizes no such meaning."

The hopeless muddle of Protestantism and utter failure to grasp the real relationship between baptism and regeneration as distinct from conversion is fully expressed in the words of the same writer, for he goes on to say:

"According to this doctrine, every one baptized is spiritually a child of God, converted, sanctified. Everything affirmed of God's children is true of him. He is a new creature, has the Spirit of Christ and is led by the Spirit. The Baptized need no conversion."

Still more difficult would it be for a Protestant to say, "I believe one Catholic and Apostolic Church." He can say the Apostles' Creed for everywhere in Protestantism the word "Catholic" means universal: universal in a geographical sense. Let Dr. W. N. Clark speak for those who wish to remain Protestants and yet be ordained to the sacred Priesthood. Speaking of the Church and its sacraments he says:

"The early church contained no priesthood. . . . If we wish to speak correctly of 'the Church' as it has historically appeared we shall be obliged to define it in a very catholic and comprehensive manner, as including the sum of those organizations which have been formed to serve as organs of Christ, for the expression and promotion of his religion. . . . No organization has promise of perpetuity, apart from its fitness for the Master's use, and Christianity may yet express itself in new forms, if the old prove insufficient or unadapted to its growing needs."

In both of the seminaries the writer attended the doctrine of Apostolical Succession was rejected. In one case the professor referred to it as "a Roman Catholic pipe-dream vainly struggled after by a few High Churchmen in the English Church." Let us hear the same two Methodist professors of theology,—one American, the other English.

Dr. Sheldon writes:

"In the aristocratic theory of the Orthodox Greek Church, and of the High Church party of the Anglican establishment, the stress is upon the episcopal office, viewed as held in continuous succession from the Apostles. Only that ecclesiastical organization, it is contended, which has bishops, standing in the unbroken line of descent from the apostles as respects their ordination, is any part of the true church. . . . Episcopacy of the Anglican or Greek type is not even brought into view in the New Testament writings, much less set forth as a perpetual requirement."

Dr. Banks writes:

"If the bishops were the designed successors of the apostles, why was the name changed? Why was the ancient and scriptural term 'apostles' discarded for 'bishops'? It is here that the whole weakness of the theory is found. If it could be shown that it was ever the divine purpose that the Church should be constituted in this way, and in no other, we might be willing to assume a great deal as to the fulfillment, and to explain the deficiency of evidence by the scantiness of early records, as we do on other occasions. But it is not so. There is no doctrine of the church in scripture, standing in the same relation to the Roman and Anglican dogma, as the doctrine of the Trinity bears to the dogma of the Trinity, or as the teaching about the Lord's Day and Baptism in Scripture bears to the belief and practice of the Church on these questions."

The late Dr. Paisley, lecturing on the Christian Ministry said:

"There are no three orders of ministry. Bishops and Elders or Presbyters are the same. Priests there are none. There have been no priests since Christ. He and he alone had a sacrifice to offer. In one sense it is true that every man, woman and child is for himself or herself a priest before God. Any man who attempts to stand in any way between men and God is usurping a position for which there is no scriptural warrant. Deacons are laymen. The Congregationalists have the right idea of what a deacon really is. Stephen made the mistake of thinking he was in the ministry and started to preach instead of attending to his tables and you will remember, gentlemen, the trouble he found himself in."

The Methodist Church in America which claims to have Bishops, officially declares that its Bishops are nothing more than Elders elected to a governing position. Yet in practice they have a consecration service for their Bishops and it is their Bishops who ordain Deacons and Elders.

Bishop Quayle, when presiding over the Methodist Conference held in the People's Temple in Boston, some few years ago, declared that "there was but one genuine Apostolical Succession, namely, the succession of men baptized with the Holy Spirit: a gift which God was always willing to bestow upon all his ministers who truly seek that gift."

The culminating point of the whole matter is that there is no true conception in Protestantism of the sacramental nature of the Church.

There is no need to hesitate in saying that no Protestant minister can truthfully say that he believes the Nicene Creed. If there were such an one he could no longer remain with those who flatly deny what that Creed teaches. He would seek, not merely Episcopal ordination, but the fullest fellowship in the one Catholic and Apostolic Church.

We need not, therefore, change our canons; we need go no farther with the Concordat if the above statement is true. The Nicene Creed is an impassable barrier. Any man who comes seeking Episcopal ordination to the sacred priesthood but wishes to remain a Protestant minister does not believe or accept the Nicene Creed. We believe that ever within the councils of the true Church of Christ the Holy Spirit has been guiding its deliberations. How easy a thing it would have been for the Convention of 1919 to have made the suggested condition an acceptance of the Apostles' Creed instead of the Nicene Creed. Almost any Protestant could honestly have said that he did believe that the former, but he cannot the latter. Where we would have endangered the sacred trust of centuries, an allwise and guiding Providence has led the Church to erect, unconsciously it may be, a barrier against that which would endanger our sacred heritage.

Theory and Practice in Religious Education

MILDRED MERRILL

IN the past fifty years education as a whole has undergone radical changes. New methods have been introduced, and old material has been made new, or it appears new, or it appears under a new form. The child of today is not the child of yesterday; and religious education as heretofore presented has been proved inadequate to meet the needs of the child. But wherein lies the failure? Surely not in the religion itself. The failure lies in the fact that religious educators as a whole do not *understand* psychology in its *relation to the development of the child, and the methods of education required at each stage of development*.

With the recognition of the fact that there are different stages of development, is the equally important fact that each stage is not isolated but integrated. According to Froebel, "The period of infancy demands fostering care, in childhood training prevails. Boyhood is the period of instruction. And all differences in kind are brought about by the *gradual* accumulation of differences in degree." Froebel is the acknowledged child psychologist. Froebel's ideal in education is to fertilize the seeds of thought native to the mind, and when they begin to grow, to provide the right nourishment in the right amount. Froebel made it clear that we are to fertilize the soil with *right emotions*. We have noted Froebel's application of psychology to education. Psychology has been aptly defined as the science of the soul. Let us apply our science to re-

religious education, in relation to the germination of the seeds implanted in the soul in baptism. For the light of the Froebelian principle permeates our problem. As Froebel recognized seeds of thought native to the soil of the mind, the church affirms that the seeds of faith, hope, and love, are infused in the soul in baptism. We must recognize the fact that the duty of religious educators is *to nurture the indigenous virtues of the baptized soul*.

We are in fact to apply religion to psychology. Psychology deals with the natural child capable of good or bad feelings, good or bad thoughts, good or bad deeds. Through the extension of the incarnation in baptism the natural native impulse is raised to a celestial virtue. The natural child inherits a wounded feeling, intellect and will. Froebel was not only an educator, but a religious mystic, and stated that, "These celestial virtues will link his life with the divine life through which all life is one with the God who is the supernal Life, Light and Love." The late Miss Susan E. Blow tells us that it is not easy to nurture faith, hope and love; but, that it is the church's true mission "to first take the sleeping soul by the hand and bid it—arise." Our point of departure is to develop right emotions. The late Miss Susan E. Blow reaffirms Froebel's statement—"Is it not a prime duty of education to nurture those indigenous emotions out of which the virtues grow?" But Miss Blow also states that, "With the recognition of the fact that the seeds of truth will germinate only in a soil which has been made fertile with right emotion, we must also admit that there is no feeling worthy the name but is as dew around an idea." Feeling must be to thought what the wind is to the flame. "Feeling is the unity out of which intellect and will rise. It is in fact unconscious intellect and will."

To understand feeling, we must consider it in relation to the nature of mind, "For mind is not an organism. It is not composed of parts, neither is it separable into distinct faculties. It is a self-active energy, having different phases of manifestation, but wholly present in each phase. It expresses itself in feeling, thought and will; but there is no feeling in which thought and will are not latent, no true thought which does not excite a corresponding feeling and issue in an act, no genuine deed which is not the embodiment alike of feeling and of thought. The mind may be deformed by exaggeration of a single phase.

According to Froebel, imagination is the predominant mental activity between the ages of four and six. Reason is latent in imagination. Are we not enlightened? "In order to educate the heart we must illumine the imagination." Over and over again, Froebel speaks of the still presentiments which lie hidden in the soul of the child. The child possesses certain premonitions—a *knowing* without *understanding*. It was premonitions of this character which the child-heart of blessed Mary kept and pondered. "May not the deepest truths be made to *stir* as presentiments in the awakening mind? May not the profoundest spiritual insights be *rooted in* the sympathies and *fostered by* the will? Typical facts appeal to the imagination, and through imagination to feeling and will." But Froebel had a deeper insight—He perceived that, "in view of the young child's primary and persistent need for self-expressive activity, typical facts must be presented in the guise of typical *acts*." The by-word of the kindergarten is *act*. Modern psychology has discovered the priority of action over conscious thought. Modern child study has discovered the

superior merit of Catholic over Protestant methods of developing the religious sense. "The Catholic Church quickens religious impulse, but the appeal to imagination may be made more potent by enlisting the child's own activity in the revelation of the ideal."

Let us ask ourselves: What are the typical facts of religion we would reveal to the child? Are we interested in his prayer life? Then we must teach him not only prayers, but how to pray. The folded hands, the kneeling posture, the closed eyes, have they not their symbolic significance? Are they not typical acts of the beating heart of the life of prayer? "The forces of the heart are faith and love." May not the reverent performance of these symbolic acts educate the religious impulses, stir the latent energies of the baptized soul? Do we want the child to lift up his heart and praise God? Then let him sing praises to God and inspire him with the love of God manifest in human relationships and the world around him.

Do we want the child to be loving and kind, truthful, obedient and brave? Have we no typical characters, concrete examples, we would have the child represent? What childish heart has not thrilled at the words, "Dare to be a Daniel?" Have we no ideal types of character with which to illumine the imagination? "The duties of life rise out of relationships, and the doing of duty creates ideal types of character." Consider the child Samuel—is not faithful obedience embodied in the tale? Samuel heard the voice of God because he was an obedient child. And we must not overlook the fact that Samuel was born of a mother who prayed in faith. In the selection of our story there must be insight into the inner meaning. There is a vision for even the four year old child. Our duty as religious educa-

tors does not end with the concrete example. Would we have the child faithful to duty? Then we must give him small duties to perform and be zealous as to the way they are performed.

Has the Church no typical objects to offer her children? "The type forms of the kindergarten are primarily play-things." Froebel asserted "*that playing with them concentrates attention on them.*" This does not mean that in the church school we are to give the children sacred things to handle promiscuously. "That which the child does with pleasure is play."

It does mean that we are to be alive to the significance of the church bell which says "come" the door through which we go into the church, the window which lets the light into God's house. It does mean that a cross hung around the neck may have a spiritual import. It does mean that the child's senses are keenly alert to the cross, the flowers and lights of the altar. It does mean that we are to give sympathetic interest to the eager tale of the altar built at home, mayhap with blocks, or a box. It does mean that the children are to be made *aware*. (Instruction and explanation are ruled out at the symbolic stage). Typical objects of this character the Church may well offer to her children.

Before considering the practice of religion in the church school let us bring once more to mind our psychological principles.

Fertilize with right emotions the seeds of thought native to the mind. Nurture the indigenous virtues of the baptized soul.

Feeling must be to thought, what the wind is to the flame.

Imagination is the predominant mental activity between the ages of four and six.

Reason is latent in imagination. Typical facts appeal to the imagination.

Present, typical facts in the guise of typical acts.

It must be remembered that Froebel's development of the religious spirit is rooted and grounded in the innate *feeling of community* in the child. "Early the child feels he is not alone in life." He considered the child in relation to nature, humanity and God. With the feeling of community as the point of departure for moral education clearly in mind, we can understand Froebel's statement in regard to the child and his church experiences. "In all families where church-going has any real meaning, stands in relation to corporate and individual life, the children are anxious to go to church and count an occasional participation in its services as a great privilege and joy. This joy in the first instance springs not from any understanding of what is said or sung, but from the simple fact that with inner collectedness and devotion all the worshipping congregation sing the same hymns, unite in the same prayers." In moral education, corporate and individual life are inevitably bound together. Let us consider moral education of little children in the symbolic stage. The experiences which the church school provides must be of a vital religious character. The room should breathe forth a religious atmosphere. The pictures on the wall should be within the child's conception.

The service should be short but in every detail ritually correct. Secular verse forms are out of place.

If the children march, it should be in procession with a banner.

If a Litany hymn is used for a processional, it should be in the correct Litany form.

The offering should be taken by a small member of the

congregation. The alms basin should be passed exactly as it is done in church (through imitation the child is playing himself into the ideal). Music should be provided here, to hold the children's attention. If possible a *vested* choir boy should sing.

The Lesson Story should be drawn from the Bible. In thought it should present a child version of the church year. In the selection of the theme, we must consider the vital thought which lies back of the particular season, in relation to the child, rather than adherence to the specified Gospel or Epistle of the calendar. This is the sermon period.

The class-time should be orderly. Ponder for a moment—recall the intimate talks of our Lord with the chosen few. Does it not reveal in a flash the real significance of this period? Intimate talks should be encouraged. The children should be drawn out—led to talk freely about the story and the picture for the day. Appropriate nature stories have their place in this period.

Luckow tells us that in the parable of the sower our Lord teaches us that there is an analogy to be drawn between the operations of nature and grace, that our Lord shows how the spiritual and natural kingdoms are governed and controlled by similar laws. It is also made clear in His justification of the parabolic form of teaching that it serves to veil the truth, on the ground that immediate revelation is not always desirable. So far, so good. "Light must be given gently." Froebel had a wonderful insight into the spiritual meaning of nature. He recognized nature as a "vast symbol." But in both our Lord's teaching and Froebel's, an analogy lay back of it. The material was at hand. There is a wonderful analogy between the sea and the soul.

But one must have felt the spell of the sea to know. We are not studying nature for nature's sake. And nature stories and nature material are valuable only in so far as they clothe an ideal or truth, which is analogically related to the soul. Otherwise there is danger of resting on nature, not the God of nature. All outward experience is for reflection in the soul. God made the world to make us reflect—"For what is a symbol but a natural object, action, or event which is analogically related to some spiritual fact or process?"

The symbolic acts may be given during this period. "Who can show me what we do with our hands when we pray? "Let us all fold our hands as if we were praying." All the correct positions may be given in this way, but these exercises should never be given by an untrained teacher. The children are not to be made conscious of what they are doing. Excursions may be taken to see the big door through which we go into church, the bell which hangs high in the steeple, the windows of beautiful colored glass with the many stories they tell. (The *light* which shines in should always be noted.) On the return to the class room, the experience should be recalled, and the story of any particular window should be chosen by the children.

The verses learned by the children should always be Bible verses, simple but vital.

This is the period to learn hymns or any necessary rote work. If we recall our Lord and the children, we will realize that at this time we gather the children around us and are one with them.

Throughout the entire session there should be no apparent discipline. But a reverent order must be maintained, inspired by the teacher, who, as Froebel says, must make her union with God shine through all that she does.

The pedagogics underlying this article have been drawn from Psychologic "Foundations of Education" by the late William F. Harris, A.M., LL.D., "Educational Issues, Symbolic Education," by the late Susan E. Blow. The capricious methods of religious education now in vogue have compelled me to seek a sane refuge for the church school in the principles underlying the philosophy of Froebel. It will be understood that this article does not set forth a program, but an adjustable method of procedure as a guide for untrained teachers.

There is much good in the series known as the Christian Nurture Series. But a little truth is dangerous. Through a failure to apprehend clearly the inner essence of Froebel's "Self-Activity," the Christian Nurture Series has been tainted by certain radical methods which have been in vogue in Protestant Sunday schools for more than ten years. We have however much to learn in the way of organization from the various denominations. In the General Description—page 8—of the Christian Nurture Series the principle seems to be inconsistent with the method. The principle places "the child" in the center and recognizes the law of growth to be the highest consideration. This principle deals with the natural child, and not the child as rooted in God through baptism. Christian nurture presupposes baptism and assumes that nurture is to be according to Christian principles. Hence the baptized child must be placed in the center. Christian nurture can have but one consideration,—an ever increasing development of the Christian consciousness. So the germination and nurture of the infused virtues must be the highest consideration. The law of growth implies good or bad growth.

We must question Christian Nurture's theory as to feeling. "Feeling is stronger than thought in early childhood; we aim to produce on the child's part the right feeling toward the elementary and cardinal facts of the Christian Faith." "Right feeling toward" simply implies an attitude of mind. We do not want the child to grow up to be as the Church-warden of Victor Hugo's "Les Miserables." "He went to Mass from good feeling rather than devotion." Froebel's greatest contribution to child psychology is that "typical facts must be presented in the guise of typical acts." We must ever keep before us the fact that the mind is not an organism, also that "there is no feeling worthy the name which is not as dew around an idea." Through recognition "of the priority of action over conscious thought," Froebel sought to prepare the child "through doing for *seeing*, through the exertion of his power for its comprehension, through self-activity to lead him to self-knowledge." In the doing of the typical ideal deed, the child holds up the ideal to himself in realization.

As to the child's actions—Do we want him to regulate his actions instinctively by the truth of Divine Fatherhood? Or do we, as the ideal of moral education suggest, *want to stir in him* impulses which will make him *want* to do the things he ought to do.

In the selection of themes and their interpretation, Christian Nurture lacks insight into the inner meaning of the story. It reads its own ideas into the Scripture. The Bible gives no suggestion that Samuel was afraid in the dark. "After that he always felt safe because he knew the loving Father was near him, taking care of him in the dark night." We must not read our own ideas into Holy Scripture.

Christian Nurture fails to understand symbolic education. One instance, in the story of Jacob's Dream—"no mention is to be made of the ladder; the child will take it literally." If we would teach the children, we must become as children. The little child is symbolic. All things are possible. He "sees through a glass darkly." All things are shrouded in symbolic form. The ladder symbolizes communication with heaven. It brings heaven near. In its most vital essence, Jacob's ladder points to the incarnation. The descent of the divine to the human that the human may be raised to the divine (the angels ascending and descending). Will we never learn? With the child in the symbolic stage we *do not explain*. What is the significance of the "touch of the hem" "the mud on the eyes," if not contact? The ladder is the concrete, the child is symbolic, he does not question. And if so, the ladder is legitimate,—it was seen *in a dream*.

One word as to hand-work. My one hope is that we may stem its unwise use.

The Froebelian kindergartener takes her children in a group to church, at Thanksgiving, Christmas and Easter. Each excursion is the crowning experience of a series of experiences,—among them the game of the church, which has been reverently played in kindergarten. Every effort is made to have this experience a vital one—let us rise to our responsibility. Shall the child on Sunday go to the church school and find tables arranged for drawing, cutting, coloring, sand modeling, etc.? Ponder for a moment the significance of the folk game, "on Monday we wash, Tuesday we iron . . . Sunday we go to Church." The child learns through

differences and comparisons. Froebel would have the child self-active. Seeking to arouse force within—he gave ample means for self-expression. He realized that back of all things is God. But the child learns through limitations. We are dealing with the religious experience in its ideal form, “the visible institution whose mission is to hold up the Divine Ideal as the object of adoration and worship.” Consider the chaos in the child’s mind. From actual experience the answer of a child is quoted:

“What did you do in Sunday School today?”

“I colored birds.”

We must realize the real significance of self-activity. Self-activity is not bodily action to counteract physical restlessness.” On the contrary, Froebel seized upon the impulsive movements of the baby and gave them educational import. The little child’s physical restlessness, Froebel seized upon and gave it physical aimfulness with a spiritual import. In this light we will not give the child objects because he “has a passion for touching what he sees.” Rather we shall realize that if we wish the spiritual grasp to succeed the material grasp, we must do as Froebel suggests, teach the child that he *cannot* grasp everything he sees. When the real significance of self-activity has awakened the ideal in our hearts, we shall not have been “unmindful of the heavenly vision.”

BOOK REVIEWS

Fellowship in Thought and Prayer. By Basil Mathews and Harry Biseker. With an Introduction by Bishop Brent. 111 pages. New York, Edwin S. Gorham, 1920.

The authors of this little volume have produced a vital book on a vital topic. The subject of fellowship is in the air. Everywhere we meet with the demand for co-operation, for association, for unity,—all of which terms denote, or at any rate connote this same idea. It is well to have the idea of religious fellowship clarified and defined. The authors lay great stress on the need of fellowship in all matters of interest to mankind. Yet for fellowship in prayer one other thing is needed, namely that this fellowship be a communion with one another that is based on our common communion with God in Christ. Here lies the ultimate principle of the unity of mankind,—of all peoples, races, and tongues, in the Kingdom of God. The authors point out that here lies the only hope of solving the vexed problems of the interrelations of the various antagonistic races and the warring nations of men.

From these facts they proceed to the religious fellowship as such. They instance fellowships, the highest of which was that of Jesus Christ and His apostles, the Church of Antioch, St. Francis of Assisi and his companions, and others, which were—first of all—fellowships in thought and prayer, and which eventuated in practical activities that have brought blessings unnumbered to all the world. They insist that absolute similarity in habits of thought, in social standing, or in character is neither possible nor desirable. The only principle of unity must be communion with God in Christ. That given, the fellowship, whether large or small, whether national or local, whether national or international, whether denominational or interdenominational, will be success, provided the members wait on God in the prayer of faith, actually seeking His guidance. The only limit set to the answer to such united prayer is the receptivity of the members of the group. Generally unanimity of thought results from such prayers; but this is not always the case. Several interesting experiences are cited, showing the practical working of the method.

The result of these fellowship meetings for prayer and prayerful discussion usually is some concerted action, whether in the church or in the

community, either for increased efficiency in any one of the various functions of the local church, or of the diocese, the province, or the national church, or for the reform of some evil in the local community or the state. Many practically helpful suggestions of objects for such united intercession are given; and the methods are fully explained.

The book is very well written, easily and delightfully read at one sitting, and is equally well adapted to use in a class or a circle. Bishop Brent has written an excellent and appreciative introduction, in which he adds what was lacking in the text,—the suggestion that the larger fellowship, the communion of the saints should always be kept in view.

F. C. H. W.

The Christian Doctrine of Faith. Edited by James Hastings, D.D., New York. Charles Scribner's Sons, 1919.

This is the second volume of the series entitled "The Great Christian Doctrines" and is a work of the same general character as its predecessor, "The Christian Doctrine of Prayer," published five years ago. It is not a theological treatise, nor would it be fair to describe it as a mere compilation of sermon stuff, though it belongs in the department of homiletics. In eighteen chapters it deals systematically with various aspects of faith, bringing together under each heading appropriate excerpts from the writings of theologians, preachers, poets, novelists, philosophers, and scientists. With all this there are numerous anecdotes, judiciously chosen to illustrate the points under discussion, and the appearance of the whole is that of a carefully wrought mosaic rather than indiscriminate patchwork. The parts are complete in themselves and are arranged in logical order. Thus, the Introduction discusses the importance, the necessity, and the heroism of faith; the next three chapters are concerned with faith in one's self, faith in men, and the range of faith (in daily life, in science, in society, and in the religious life) and all this prepares the reader for the theme of Chapter V—"Faith in God."

There is a great deal of applied theology in the book, and a minimum of strict theological discussion, what there is of it being decidedly on Protestant lines and of a moderate and conservative character. A case in point is its treatment of justification, where it avoids the extremes of Protestant polemic and seeks to do justice to the place which the Church

and the sacraments have in the scheme. Liberal use is made of the works of Anglican writers including those of the Catholic school.

One feature worthy of mention is the carefully selected bibliography prefixed to each section—following the plan adopted in the earlier volume of the series—amounting in the aggregate to nearly six hundred titles of books and articles, including duplicates. Dr. Hastings thinks that the great question for all preachers, young and old alike, is *materials*, and this compilation and classification of the sources, apart from facilitating the reader in his study, is significant of the quality of the editor's work. He uses in the majority of cases the works of contemporary writers, noticing some that have appeared in the last few months, and thus keeps abreast of the thought of our time. He has solved the problem of materials for sermons on faith and its related subjects, and in a manner that is a vast improvement on the stereotyped lines of ordinary homiletical "helps." For this reason we commend it to the attention of our own clergy as something suggestive and helpful.

THEODORE B. FOSTER.

The Ministry of Women. A Report by a Committee appointed by the Archbishop of Canterbury. The Macmillan Co. New York. 1920.

This pamphlet is reprinted from the volume entitled "The Ministry of Women," issued in August, 1919, by S. P. C. K. Those interested in the matter and subject of its contents will find still more interest in the articles contained in theological journals, either prior to, or after this report. We are told that it represents only such investigations as are historical in character.

The attention given to the order of deaconesses prevails over any consideration of religious orders for women such as one might expect in a work of this kind. The impression consequently derived is, that historically, deaconesses antedate "nuns." Yet it is extremely doubtful whether, noting conditions and institutional developments in the early Church, sisterhoods do not bear a stronger resemblance both historically and practically to the institution of "deaconesses" here described by early writers, than to any modern order of deaconesses, so called. It would seem that by historical comparisons, modern sisterhoods and religious orders already present in the field, are the rightful heirs of such high privileges and

responsibilities as the Church has ever conceded to women, and that in attempting to define the position, rights, forms of consecration to office, and duty of women in the days of Nicarete of Bithynia, by research, we are only discovering the identical traditional position, rights, vows, and consecration to office, (call it ordination if you like) of any modern novice.

C. W. B.

The Spirit. The Relation of God and Man, considered from the Standpoint of Recent Philosophy and Science. By A. Seth Pringle-Pattison, LL.D., D.C.L., J. A. Hadfield, M.A., M.B., C. A. Anderson Scott, M.A., C. W. Emmet, B.D., A. Clutton-Brock, and Others. Edited by B. H. Streeter, M.A., Fellow of Queen's College, Oxford, Canon Residentiary of Hereford. New York, The Macmillan Company, 1919.

The purpose of the school of "Modern Churchmen" in their numerous efforts to reconstruct theology has been so frequently avowed that it hardly needs reassertion: but every fresh exemplification of it besides being so much added emphasis is a progressive disclosure of the results to which it leads. This is notably true of the book now before us. The editor and his fellow contributors are deeply concerned about what they hold to be a needless *impasse* between the Church and the living thought of the day, and their method of ending this is to discard what they are agreed in regarding as the non-essential elements of Christianity. The Church is styled by one of them "the greatest spiritual tradition in the world's history": but how it can be so regarded by those who would reduce its faith to a strictly naturalistic basis is not at first sight clear. The one thing which has given this spiritual tradition any vitality, the sole factor which accounts for its survival through all vicissitudes, is its stubborn adherence to the supernatural. The supreme manifestation of the supernatural is Jesus Christ. This has been consistently the Church's message. The present group of essayists have their own view of the supernatural, being willing to use the *word* if they may strip it of its time honored associations, but they would much prefer to abolish its use altogether. And this would seem to us the sensible thing to do. They believe that "God works only naturally" (p. 32) and the point we make just here is that if the Church had only received their enlightenment at the very beginning "the greatest spiritual tradition" aforesaid would not be a datum for either admiration or adverse criticism today, any more than

anything that is non-existent. Of course, the rejoinder to this would be that the essential thing in the old and now hopelessly discredited belief in the supernatural was insistence on God's working, the very thing which it is the purpose of this book to reassert—the idea that the universe is fundamentally spiritual—while the non-essential thing was the manner in which His working was conceived, a thing impossible for the modern mind. But this is after all simply begging the question as to what in Christianity is essential. We can have no quarrel with an interpretation of the universe which sees God working in it, so long as we escape a pantheistic conception. When, however, it is suggested that any frank recognition of the immanence of God at once disposes of the idea or the possibility of the "supernatural"—identified here with "interference with nature"—this is a proposition which the history of Christian thought and belief abundantly refutes.

A test of the results for positive faith which the naturalistic view of the essayists achieves is given by one of them (Lily Dougall) in the following:

"Those who believe that nature is a progressive revelation of God's character and purpose believe, *either* that our Lord's coming into and going out of this world were not physically different from the birth and entry into eternal life of other men, *or* that, if they were different, that difference was something truly natural to humanity at its highest and best . . . the supreme instance of the power of mind over body—a power increasingly realized today."

It is by the expedient of the latter alternative that we are to square the faith with "psychological law"—and, we may add, with something else not within the purview of the writer, to wit, the dogmas of Christian Science. In saying this we of course do not mean to imply that the principles of this eccentric cult have any place in the sober reasoning of these essayists, but only to note a solitary instance of accidental agreement.

If it were possible within the limits of the space permitted, we should like to review each of the ten essays at length. They are the work of scholars, and they are concerned with mighty themes. The treatment is, as needless to remark, reverent and stimulating to the reader, at times extraordinarily fascinating and persuasive. It would seem invidious to express a preference, but for ourselves the first of these papers, "Immanence and Transcendence," by Pringle-Pattison, and the third, "The Psychology of Power" (on psychotherapy) by Captain Hadfield, a physician, are the most important. Canon Streeter who writes the introduction, out-

lining the general topic as the attempt to relate the Christian doctrine of the Spirit with the modern vitalistic conception of the Power behind phenomena, also contributes the final essay, on "Christ the Constructive Revolutionary." It is here that we are face to face with the application of the results of the book's re-examination of the doctrine of the Spirit. What the Church needs at the present day, and apparently at once, is "constructive revolution" after the pattern of Christ. Great changes are impending, affecting our theory and practice in every sphere of human activity, political, social, moral, and religious. The Church must undergo a revolution, or else cease for all time to come to be a providential factor in the uplifting of the human race. In his judgment it isn't any ordinary call to reformation such as has been heard in earlier crises of her history, still less the suggestion that she is not functioning properly (the consciousness of which is always her saving grace) but she is facing the supreme, the final, crisis in her experience. Events of our day are speaking to her with the warning and the judgment of our Lord in His parable of the barren fig tree and His lament over faithless Jerusalem. She is indeed spared for a brief period of probation, but in her present state she only cumberes the ground. Mr. Streeter is optimist enough to believe that she still has her day of grace in which to realize the things that belong to her peace. But his view of her condition is one of extreme pessimism. In his comparison of her state with that of a Judaism gone to seed—the expression is ours but the idea is precisely his—we have an imaginative parallel which in spite of his artistic skill no sane reader will concede to be true to fact. It is a parallel which conveniently ignores one factor of her consciousness, the divine guarantee of her perpetuity, which has nerved her in every crisis (instead of lulling her into easy security) because it has animated her to fight for her life in the certainty of victory. Of course the omission of this or anything like it from Mr. Streeter's scheme is characteristic and entirely in keeping with his point of view. In the absence of the apostolic conception of the Spirit's relation to the Church, the definiteness of which he says "modern thought regards as unwarranted," and laboring under the added embarrassment of a defective Christology which perforce minimizes the significance of the Church as "the Body of Christ," there is naturally nothing to restrain his pessimism.

And what, as the conclusion of the whole matter, has he to offer as the solution of the problem? What program does he suggest for us? Be-

yond a few general observations as to the Church's leadership in certain social reforms there is nothing at all concrete or definite, nothing at all commensurate with the demands of the situation as he describes it. In sum, we need men who have courage to discard what is obsolete and to create what is new, and we need in this respect to follow the spirit manifested in the life of Christ. All of which is perfectly true, but not true now for the first time in the history of the Church, and certainly not specific enough to be of any real satisfaction to the reader. The fact seems to be that Mr. Streeter does not know just what to say, or perhaps the revolution as he sees it is too appalling in its character, and so entirely destructive that its "constructive" side would hardly appear. In describing the "iconoclastic ring" of our Lord's utterances he remarks that "by the side of them the programmes of our modern leaders seem tinkering timidities." We do not know who are meant by this reference, but it is a safe presumption that he is not thinking of the powers that be in the Church of England. Indeed this is certain from the terms of his parallel. He must be referring to critics of the established order, but we are not unkind enough to suggest the inclusion of the "Modern Churchmen" in this category. With all their faults the last thing to be imputed to them is timidity, and to describe their efforts as tinkering would be a manifest absurdity. But in any view of the case he appears to feel that satisfactory leadership is lacking, the "Constructive Revolutionary" is demanded and the world is only waiting for his guidance. Here the matter rests.

With all that the book contains that is of interest to the theologian and the general reader, the most that can be claimed for it in the way of positive achievement is its coordination of the distinct but closely related determinations of various departments of contemporary thought in a theological view. But in spite of its earnestness and fervor, and our sympathy with its beautiful and devotional climax, the end is disappointing. Not only so. We are persuaded that it does not express in its anxiety over the present crisis the mind of the Church, and her joyous faith in the guidance and guardianship of the Holy Spirit. She still exclaims, and never more confidently than now,

*Ductore sic Te praevio
Vitemus omne noxium.*

THEODORE B. FOSTER.